THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616996

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

2 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TO THE FOURTH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1902.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1902.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_november-20-december-4-1902_115

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. ; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal ; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621 ; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols. ; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols. ; Almon's Debates, 24 vols. ; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols. ; The Hardwicke Papers ; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table :—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3 —	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 115	2	—	1902

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Chas. T. Ritchie, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Austen Chamberlain, Esq., M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury, M.P.
President of the Board of Education——The Most Noble the Marquess of Londonderry.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——W. Hayes Fisher, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, Bt., M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——Hugh O. Arnold-Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  H. T. Anstruther, Esq., M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Vice-Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Vice-Admiral A. L. Douglas.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Capt. John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Lord Cranborne, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——Lord Stanley, M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. Lord Windsor.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice Chamberlain——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Victor C. W. Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Buckhounds——Right Hon. Lord Chesham.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. Balfour.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——Charles Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir David Harrel, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Geo. Wright, Esq., K.C.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Henry J. L. Graham, Esq., C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. Monro, Esq.
Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J F. Skene, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; and A. Tennyson, Esq.
Accountant——G. Fulkes, Esq.
Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. Norris.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——S. Arthur Strong, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk ——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
    Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
    Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
    Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
    Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq ; H. C. Tower, Esq. ; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; A. F. B. Williams, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq. ; C. D. Robertson, Esq. ; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Chaplain to the House——Rev. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——Philip Smith, Esq. ; H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——Temple Francks, Esq., B.C.L. ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R. Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram, T. Martin.
Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXV.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1902.

HOUSE OF LORDS, THURSDAY, 20TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA.—Correspondence relating to the appeal of the Boer Generals to the civilised world 1

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Grants for school teachers' houses 1

INDIA (SANITARY MEASURES).—Report on sanitary measures in India in 1900–1901. Volume 34. 1

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.—Area, houses and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces and infirmities, of the counties of Berks, Monmouth, Northampton, Cornwall.

Presented [by Command] and ordered to lie on the Table 1

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT.—Minutes sanctioning subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the counties of Carmarthen (first minute); Glamorgan (twelfth minute); Salop (fifth minute) ... 1

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow No. 2) Regulations for degrees in science in public health.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table ... 2

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (NO. 2) BILL.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be read 2ª on Monday next (The Lord President [*Duke of Devonshire*]); and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with... 2

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.—Message from the Commons for Lord Welby to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House 2

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.—Moved, that the Earl Waldegrave be appointed to take the Chair in the Committee of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*); agreed to 2

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:

Lord Davey 3

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 14, to leave out 'the Judicial Committee may order,' and after 'patentee' to insert 'may be ordered by an Order in Council.'"—*Lord Davey.*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Chanccellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*). 3

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [H.L.]—Commons' Amendments considered (according to Order).

The Earl of Halsbury 3

On Question, Commons' Amendments agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till Tomorrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 20TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from North-West Surrey; South Bristol; and Dunfermline; to lie upon the Table 4

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Southampton; and Wargrave; to lie upon the Table 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA.—Copy presented of Correspondence relating to the Appeal of the Boer Generals to the Civilised World [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

Nov. 20.] Page

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.—Copies presented of two Orders in Council, giving effect to Rules of Court under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 4

EAST INDIA (OPIUM). — Address for "Return of further Correspondence between the India Office and the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 120, of Session 1902.)" (*Mr. Henry J. Wilson*) 4

PARLIAMENT (DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS).—Copy ordered "of Contract, granted the 15ih day of September, 1902, to Messrs. Wyman and Sons (Limited) for Printing and Publishing Reports of Debates and Proceedings in Parliament."—*Mr. Hayes-Fisher.* 4

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LIBERIA—ALLEGED OUTRAGE ON NATIVES BY BRITISH SEAMEN ON THE "OLENDA."—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 4

CHANNEL FLEET—STATISTICS OF EFFICIENT SEAMEN.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 5

CHATHAM NAVAL BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 6

DESERTERS AND DISCHARGES FROM THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 6

ROYAL GARRISON ARTILLERY—TARGET PRACTICE SEAWARDS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 6

SEARCH OF POSTMEN—GRIEVANCE AT HASTINGS.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas (Hastings); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain. 7

"SPECIAL LEAVE"—GRIEVANCE AT HASTINGS.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 7

WAGES OF POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 8

POOR LAW—ISOLATED OR SCATTERED HOMES.—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W. R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Walter Long... 9

GROVE PARK (WOOLWICH) WORKHOUSE—LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOAN.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 10

ARGENTINA—IMPORTATION OF DISEASED ANIMALS.—Question, Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 11

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMPLOYMENT OF VETERINARY SURGEONS NOT MEMBERS OF THE R.C.V.S.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 11

NORTHUMBERLAND ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 12

NIGERIA PROTECTORATE—ARO EXPEDITION.—Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 12

SOUTH AFRICA—MARTIAL LAW COMMISSION'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 12

Nov. 20.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—GRANTS TO REPATRIATED BOERS.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 13

ARMY EXAMINATION-TEXT BOOKS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 13

VOLUNTEER CAPITATION GRANTS—CAMP LEAVE.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas (Hastings); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 14

ARMAMENT OF THE NEW CRUISERS.—Questions, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire) and Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 14

NAVY RATIONS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 15

H.M.S. "MEDUSA."—Question, Sir William Allan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 15

H.M.S. "GOOD HOPE."—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 16

INDENTURED LABOUR IN WEST INDIES AND BRITISH GUIANA.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 16

CURRENCY QUESTIONS IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA AND UGANDA.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 16

BRITISH NORTH BORNEO—RAILWAY TO THE INTERIOR.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Cranborne 17

BRITISH SUGAR REFINERIES.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 17

WELSH SUNDAY CLOSING—BOGUS CLUBS.—Question, Mr. Kenyon (Denbighshire); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 18

CANADIAN CATTLE TRADE.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 18

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS.—Question, Sir John Leng; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 19

ARGENTINE CATTLE TRADE.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 19

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT ARCHITECT.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 20

EDUCATION BILL—VOLUNTARY SCHOOL GRANTS.—Question, Sir William Houldsworth (Manchester, N.W.); Answer, Sir William Anson 20

SCHOOLS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS—PATHS REQUIRED.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) ... 20

BURYING GROUNDS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 21

Nov. 20.] Page

FISHERMEN'S DWELLINGS AT STORNOWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 21

TOLSTA SCHOOL, ISLAND OF LEWIS—OUTBREAK OF TYPHUS FEVER.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 22

TROUT PRESERVATION (CLOSE TIME) ACT.—Question, Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 22

ILLEGAL TRAWLING OFF THE CAITHNESS COAST.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 23

ATHY LICENSING PROSECUTION.—Questions, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.), and Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 23

ROADS IN QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Questions, Mr. Carew and Mr. Tully; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 24

MOHILL WORKHOUSE ENTERTAINMENT.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 25

SECOND TERM RENT REDUCTIONS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 26

MEATH ROADS.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 26

MARINE STORE DEALERS' ACT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 26

UNION SOLICITORS AS COUNTY COUNCILLORS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 27

DE FREYNE ESTATE—COST OF EXTRA POLICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 27

IRISH PRISON OFFICIALS—CHIEF WARDER HENNESSY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 28

MARYBOROUGH GAOL—LYNCHEHAUN'S ESCAPE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 28

PROMOTION IN THE BELFAST POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 28

BALLYMONEY AND PORTRUSH POST OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 29

EDUCATION BILL—CLOSURE PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 29

AID GRANTS TO ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.—Questions, Col. Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle); and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 30

AMENDMENT OF THE REGISTRATION LAWS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 31

Nov. 20.] *Page*

Ice Cream Shops (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill—Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn. ... 31

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Managers):—

Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) ... 31

Amendment proposed—

"In line 16, to leave out the words, 'In making an order under this section with regard to any school, the Board of Education shall have regard to the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words, 'In making an order under this section with regard to any school, the Board of Education shall have regard to' stand part of the Clause, as amended."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 32
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 33
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) ... 33
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) ... 34
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 35
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) ... 35
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) ... 36
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 37
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) ... 38
Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) ... 39
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) ... 39
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) ... 40
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) ... 41
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 41
Mr. Whitley ... 42
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 42
Mr. Bryce ... 43
Mr. Whitley ... 44
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 44

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 82. (Division List No 561.)

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) ... 47

Amendment proposed—

"In line 17, after 'regard,' insert 'to the ownership of the school building, and.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Nov. 20.] Page

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University.) 47

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar.) 47

Amendment proposed—

"After line 18, to insert, 'Provided that no such Order shall treat as denominational a school which cannot be shown to have received a denominationol character from those who established it.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 48
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 48
Mr. Bryce 48
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 49
Mr. Bryce 49
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 50
Mr. Samuel Evans 50

Amendment amended—

"By inserting, at the end, the words, 'or which has not been made denominational by a valid scheme.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 50
Mr. Whitley 51

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 86 ; Noes, 200. (Division List No. 562.)

Mr. Edmund Robertson 55

Amendment proposed—

"In line 24, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words, 'subject to the provisions of this Act, have the right of appointing and dismissing the teachers.'"—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Samuel Evans 59
Mr. A. J. Balfour 60
Mr. Bryce 61
Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon) 61
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 62

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Hugh Cecil 63

Amendment to the proposed Amendment proposed—

"After the words 'provisions of this Act,' to insert 'and to the provisions of the trust deed relating to religious education.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Samuel Evans 63
Mr. A. J. Balfour 64
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 65
Mr. Edmund Robertson 65
Mr. Bryce 66
Mr. Samuel Evans 66
Mr. A. J. Balfour 67
Mr. A. K. Loyd 67

Amendment to proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Reginald Lucas (*Portsmouth*) 68

Amendment proposed—

"In line 27, at end, to insert: '(5) Where the receipt by a school, or the trustees or managers of a school, of any endowment or other benefit is, at the time of the passing of this Act, dependent on any qualification of the managers, the qualification of the foundation managers only shall, in case of question, be regarded.'"—(*Mr. Reginald Lucas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 68

Amendment agreed to.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 225; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 563.)

Sir William Anson 71

New Clause—

"To insert as a new Clause, after Clause 10:—'Where before the passing of this Act fees have been charged in any public elementary school not provided by the local education authority, that authority shall, while they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, pay such proportion of those fees as may be agreed upon, or in default of agreement determined by the Board of Education, to the managers.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 73
Dr. Macnamara 74
Sir James Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) 77
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 79

Page

Mr. Platt Higgins (*Salford, N.*) ... 80
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 81
Mr. Whitley ... 85
Mr. Bond (*Nottingham, E.*) ... 86
Mr. Charles McArthur (*Liverpool, Exchange*) ... 88
Mr. Bryce ... 88
Sir William Anson ... 90
Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) ... 92
Mr. Randles (*Cumberland, Cockermouth*) ... 94

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 207; Noes, 116. (Division List No. 564.)

Dr. Macnamara ... 97

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again This evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Apportionment of school fees):—

Dr. Macnamara ... 97

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 'shall,' in line 3, to end of the Clause, and insert the words 'if they think fit, abolish such school fees; but if they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, shall credit the parish or parishes served by the school with the amount of the school fees as a contribution in relief of the charge upon the rates, for the purpose of Part III. of this Act.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Platt Higgins ... 102
Mr. Whitley ... 103
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 105
Mr. Whitley ... 107
Mr. Corrie Grant (*Warwickshire, Rugby*) ... 107
Mr. Malcolm (*Suffolk, Stowmarket*) ... 110
Dr. Macnamara ... 110

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 182; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 565.)

Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill.'

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 196; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 566.)

Sir William Anson ... 117

Nov. 20.] *Page*

New Clause—

"The local education authority may maintain under the provisions of this Act, but shall not be required so to maintain, any marine school, or any school which is part of, or is held in the premises of, any institution in which children are boarded, but their refusal to maintain such a school shall not render the school incapable of receiving the Parliamentary grant, nor shall the school, if not so maintained, be subject to the provisions of this Act as to the appointment of managers." —(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 118
Mr. A. J. Balfour 119
Mr. Tennant (*Berwickshire*) 120
Sir William Anson 121
Mr. Alfred Hutton 121
Sir Charles Dilke 122

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Mr. Herbert Lewis 122

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, after 'maintain,' insert 'as a public elementary school.'" —(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 228; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 567.)

It being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on another Government New Clause, on Schedules and Government New Schedules, and on other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion.

New Clause (Application of Act to Scilly Islands)—(*Sir William Anson*)—added to the Bill.

Schedules 1 and 3 disagreed to.

Schedule 4 amended.

Question put, "That this Schedule, as amended, be the Fourth Schedule to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 230; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 568.)

New Schedule (Provision as to Education Committees and Managers).—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the First Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 225; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 569.)

New Schedule (Provisions as to Transfer of Property and Officers, and Adjustment).—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the Second Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 217; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 570.)

New Schedule (Modification of Acts).—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the Third Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 571.)

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."'

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 572.)

Bill reported, as amended; to be considered upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. (Bill 303.)

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1887.—Two Orders in Council, dated 17th November, 1902, giving effect to Rules of Court; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 145

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.—University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow, No. 2). Regulations for Degrees in Science in Public Health; laid before the House yesterday, and to be printed. (No. 189)... 145

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petition from Luddenham Foot, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table 145

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Chipping Wycombe; and Oldham; to lie upon the Table 145

Nov. 21.] *Page*

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alterations: from Dendron; Newbury; and Luddenham Foot; to lie upon the Table ... 145

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Toxteth Park; Kirby; and Burscough Bridge; to lie upon the Table 145

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (BILLS IN PARLIAMENT) BILL.—Petition from Westminster, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 145

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition from Luddenham Foot, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 146

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions from Ormskirk, in favour; to lie upon the Table 146

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY AND HARBOUR GUARANTEES (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th August; *Mr. Thomas O'Donnell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 376.] 146

PARLIAMENT (DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS).—Return presented relative thereto [ordered 20th November; *Mr. Hayes-Fisher*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 377.] 146

COLONIES (GENERAL).—Copy presented, of Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, relative to the Parliamentary and Municipal and Local Representation of Trading Companies in the Colonies under Responsible Government, and the Reply of the Commonwealth of Australia thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 146

PRIVATE BUSINESS.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 378.] 146

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, that this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*) 146

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

METEOROLOGICAL GRANT COMMITTEE.—Question, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 146

NEWTON ABBOT POSTMAN'S WAGES.—Question, Mr. Seale Hayne (Devonshire, Ashburton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 147

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY—ACCIDENT NEAR CARDIFF, 14TH NOVEMBER.—Question, Mr. Philipps (Pembroke); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 147

NAVAL ORDNANCE DEPÔT'S STAFF.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 148

EAST INDIA RAILWAY—GERMAN LOCOMOTIVES.—Question, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 148

INDIAN OPIUM REVENUE.—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Lord George Hamilton... 149

Page

SOUTH AFRICA—MARTIAL LAW—ADVERTISING ACCOUNT OF THE "HET OOSTEN."—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 149

SOUTH AFRICA—FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR RELIEF OF CONCENTRATION CAMPS.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 149

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Order read, for Adjourned Debate on Question [10th November], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts."—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Wylie (Dunbartonshire) 150
Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs) 157
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 160
Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) 165
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 175
Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square) 179
Lord Charles Beresford 183
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 185
The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) ... 189
Lord Alwyne Compton (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) 194
Mr. A. J. Balfour 197

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Sir John Rolleston*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Osborne Estate Bill. — Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Question [10th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 198
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 208
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 211
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 215
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 215

Qusstion put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, that all Petitions against the Bill presented three clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Council, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, that the Committee have power to send for persons, Papers, and records.

Ordered, that Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Hayes-Fisher.*)

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

Nov. 24.] *Page*

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES (GENERAL) (PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL REPRESENTATION OF TRADING COMPANIES IN THE COLONIES UNDER RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT).—Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, and the reply of the Commonwealth of Australia thereto 217

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.—Financial Statements for 1900–1901 and 1901–1902, and Estimates for 1901–1902 and 1902–1903; [Presented, by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 217

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Two Orders in Council of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern and Southern Nigeria respectively 217

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Two Orders in Council of the 19th November, 1902: (1) Making rules for preventing collisions by vessels navigating Lake Windermere; and (2) Confirming pilotage bye-laws made by the Limerick Harbour Commissioners 217

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.—Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902, authorising an alteration in the scale of salaries of assistant masters, Royal Hospital School (Nautical Division), Greenwich ... 217

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON).—Orders made by the County Council of the county of Southampton, altering certain polling districts in the Southern or Fareham and the New Forest Divisions of the county ... 217

PUBLIC RECORDS (WAR OFFICE).—Seventh Schedule, containing a list and particulars of classes of documents existing or accruing in the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office 217

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31st MARCH, 1902).—Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the money expended and borrowed, and securities created, under the said Act to the 31st March, 1902 218

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHS).—Account showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1902, and the balance of the expenditure over the receipts, and statement additional to the above account; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 218

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.—Leave given to the Lord Welby to attend the Select Committee of the House of Commons pursuant to Message of Thursday last, if he think fit, and his Lordship consenting thereto, a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith 218

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to Order): Committee negatived: Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to Order) and dispensed with: Bill read 3ª and passed... 218

Page

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

Earl Spencer 218
The Lord President of the Council (The Duke of Devonshire) 219
Lord Tweedmouth 220
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 221

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Denbigh 222

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday, the 4th of December next.

ERRORS OF SEXTANTS.

Lord Ellenborough 222
The First Lord of the Admiralty (The Earl of Selborne) 225

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order); further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next ... 226

House adjourned at five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means ... 226

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS.)—Return ordered, "showing comparison between ships with Scotch boilers and those fitted with water-tube boilers, in the following form:—

Ships fitted with Scotch Boilers.

Class and name of Ship.			Date of first commission.	Period actually in commission.	Total cost incurred for alterations and additions since first commission.			Total cost incurred for alterations, additions and repairs since first commission.		
	Tons.	I.H.P.			Engines.	Boilers.	Total.	Engines.	Boilers.	Total.

Nov. 24.] *Page*

Ships fitted with Water-tube Boilers.

Class and name of Ship.			Date of first commission.	Period actually in commission.	Total cost incurred for alterations and additions since first commission.			Total cost incurred for alterations, additions and repairs since first commission.		
	Tons.	I.H.P.			Engines.	Boilers.	Total.	Engines.	Boilers.	Total.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 356, of Session 1902, and to include all Ships and Classes included therein)."—(*Lord Charles Beresford.*) 227

British South Africa Company.—Copy presented, of Financial Statements for 1900–1901 and 1901–02, and Estimates for 1901–02 and 1902–03 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 227

Polling Districts (County of Southampton).—Copies presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the county of Southampton altering certain polling districts in the Southern or Fareham and the New Forest Divisions of the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 227

Post Office Telegraphs.—Account presented, showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1902, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 379.] 228

Pacific Cable Act, 1901.—Account presented, showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the money expended and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act to the 31st March, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 380.] 228

Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890.—Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council, of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern and Southern Nigeria respectively [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 229

Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.—Copies presented, of two Orders in Council, of the 19th November, 1902 (i.) making rules for preventing collisions by vessels navigating Lake Windermere; and (ii.) confirming pilotage byelaws made by the Limerick Harbour Commissioners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 229

Greenwich Hospital Acts, 1865 and 1869.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902, authorising an alteration in the scale of salaries of assistant masters, Royal Hospital School (Nautical Division), Greenwich [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 229

Workhouse Nursing.—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the nursing of the sick poor in the workhouses. Part I.—Report and Summary of Recommendations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 229

Nov. 24.] Page

WORKHOUSE NURSING.—Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the Nursing of the Sick Poor in Workhouses, together with Appendix and Index to Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House 229

PUBLIC RECORDS (WAR OFFICE).—Copy of Seventh Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents existing or accruing in the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department, which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act]. 230

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PORT SANITARY AUTHORITIES.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 230

COMMITTEE ON WORKHOUSE ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes); Answer, Mr. Walter Long... 230

RANELAGH PLACE POST OFFICE, LIVERPOOL—ALLEGED INSANITARY CONDITION.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 231

PROMOTION AMONGST LIVERPOOL TELEGRAPHISTS.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 231

DUBLIN POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 232

DUBLIN POST OFFICE—CLERICAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 232

SOUTH AFRICA—PERMIT REGULATIONS—OATH OF ALLEGIANCE—CASE OF M. DU TOIT.—Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmforth); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 233

EDUCATION BILL—ELEGIBILITY OF LOCAL OFFICIALS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF EDUCATION AUTHORITY.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Sir William Anson 234

EDUCATION BILL—OBLIGATION OF MANAGERS TO DEFRAY RATES AND TAXES.—Question, Mr. Arthur Stanley (Lancashire, Ormskirk); Answer, Sir William Anson 234

EVENING SCHOOL REGULATIONS—GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Sir Wm. Anson 234

EDUCATION BILL—PROPORTION OF TAXATION PAID BY LONDON.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Ritchie ... 234

ANGLO JAPANESE TREATY—SECRET CLAUSES.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Lord Cranborne 235

COAL DUTY—DECREASE OF SHIPMENT OF COAL TO HOLLAND, BELGIUM AND BALTIC PORTS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 235

Nov. 24] *Page*

BUSHEY PARK—CONCESSION OF LAND TO LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 236

ROYAL ARTILLERY—STATUS OF COLONELS AND LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.—Question, Captain Sinclair (Forfarshire); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 237

COMMISSIONS FOR MILITIA OFFICERS—ALLOTMENT.—Question, Mr. Goulding; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 237

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—CENSORSHIP OF LETTERS AND CABLEGRAMS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Buckingham, W.) 238

SOUTH AFRICAN MORTGAGED LANDS.—Questions, Mr. Boyce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain 238

TREATMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN LOYALISTS—CASE OF REV. MR. VLOK AND REV. J. F. BOTHA.—Question, Mr. Wanklyn (Bradford, Central); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 239

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR MEDALS.—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 241

MILITARY UNIFORM CHANGES.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 241

DESTRUCTION OF DEFECTIVE AND DANGEROUS AMMUNITION.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 242

H.M.S. "GOOD HOPE."—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) and Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 242

ARGENTINE AFFAIRS—MR. BARNETT'S MURDERERS.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 243

UGANDA CURRENCY.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland); Answer, Lord Cranborne) 243

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS—KING'S AFRICAN RIFLES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Lord Cranborne 244

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF WELSH INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS—Questions, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 244

WESTERN HEBRIDES MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness-shire); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 245

MODERATOR OF THE IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 246

IRISH ELECTORAL DIVISION BOUNDARIES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) ... 246

Nov. 24.]

Page

IRISH LAND QUESTION—SUPPOSED CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND IRISH PARTY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 247

IRISH GRAZING LANDS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 247

TIPPERARY COUNTY INFIRMARY COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 248

COLONEL CLEMENT'S ESTATE IN SOUTH LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 248

DROMORE DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 248

LONDON AND THE EDUCATION BILL.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) and Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 249

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 250

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.

Amendments to, Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords] without Amendment 250

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.—That they give leave to the Lord Welby to attend in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on "National Expenditure," his Lordship consenting 251

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central*) 251

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 272

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'House,' in order to add the words 'declines to approve of the Convention relating to sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902."—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Parker Smith (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 288
Sir Wm. Holland (*Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*) 297
Mr. Bonar Law (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) 302
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*)... 308
Mr. James Reid (*Greenock*) 315
Sir J. Blundell Maple (*Camberwell, Dulwich*) 319

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed this evening.

Nov. 24.] *Page*

EVENING SITTING.

Brussels Sugar Convention.—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [this day], "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'House,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'declines to approve of the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902.'"—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

Sir J. Blundell Maple 320
Mr. W. F. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercrombie) 321
Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak) 325
Mr. Cust (Southwark, Bermondsey) 327
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 334
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 338
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 357
Sir Lewis M'Iver (Edinburgh, W.) 364

It being Midnight, Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided: Ayes, 223; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 573.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 213; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 574.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent—
1. Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2).
2. Supreme Court of Judicature 373

WORKHOUSE NURSING. — Departmental Committee appointed by the Local Government Board to inquire into the nursing of the sick poor in workhouses :—

Part I. Report and Summary of recommendations.
Part II. Minutes of evidence, together with appendix and index to evidence 373

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.—Report on the Dutch Brined Vegetable Industry; Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table 373

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Thurday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION—MESSAGE TO ATTEND THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.—The House went; and, being returned, Mr. Speaker reported the Royal Assent to—
1. Appropriation (No. 2) Act, 1902.
2. Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1902 373

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: From Birkenhead and Battersea; to lie upon the Table 373

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions from Ayr, against; to lie upon the Table 374

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alterations: From Battersea and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table 374

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Parr, in favour; to lie upon the Table 374

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition from Battersea, for legislation; to lie upon the Table... 374

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. (No. 381) 374

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (DUTCH BRINED VEGETABLE INDUSTRY).—Copy presented of Report on the Dutch Brined Vegetable Industry [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 374

Nov. 25.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

FEVER IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A Graham Murray 374

TRANSFER OF BRITISH TRAWLERS TO FOREIGN FLAGS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 375

ACCIDENT AT WAVERLEY STATION, EDINBURGH—SHUNTING OPERATIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 375

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS — CASE OF JAMES YOUNGER OF NOTTINGHAM. — Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 376

METROPOLITAN COMMON POOR FUND.—Question, Sir George Fardell (Paddington, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 376

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — REWARDS FOR ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 377

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY BILL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 377

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AND BOARD OF TRADE OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Methyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 378

EDUCATION BILL—TEACHERS IN VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Robert Mowbray (Lambeth, Brixton); Answer, Sir William Anson 378

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOLDIERS' FAMILIES.—Question, Mr. Seale-Hayne (Devonshire, Ashburton); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 378

ARMY CORPS.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton): Answer, Lord Stanley 379

PRACTICE AMMUNITION FOR THE NAVY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 379

INDIAN NATIVE ARMY—PROMOTIONS OF COLONELS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.)... 380

INCREASED PAY OF BRITISH SOLDIERS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Earl Percy 381

SHANGHAI—WITHDRAWALS OF INTERNATIONAL TROOPS —Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 381

INCOME TAX COLLECTION.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 382

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL—TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE.—Question, Sir John Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 382

LLANGOLLEN NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 383

Page

SLIGO AND BUNDORAN RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) ... 383

IRISH COUNTY INFIRMARIES—SURCHARGE OF ILLEGAL EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 384

SLIGO AND LEITRIM ASYLUMS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 384

PHŒNIX PARK CONSTABULARY DEPÔT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 385

SHANNON DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 385

SANDFORD ESTATE, CASTLEREA.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 385

RULES OF PROCEDURE.—Questions, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-on-Trent) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 385

IRELAND AND THE EDUCATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Balfour 386

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Gibson Bowles, and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 387

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, considered.

Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 388

New Clause—

"From the first day of January, Nineteen hundred and four, any school where fees continue to be charged shall cease to be reckoned as a public elementary school."—(*Mr Trevelyan.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 390
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 391
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 391
Mr. White Ridley (Stalybridge) 392
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 393
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs)... 394
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 395
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 396

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 575.)

Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 401

New Clause—

"(1) In all public elementary schools, whether provided by the local education authority or not, any scholar may be withheld from the school by his parent during any time set apart for religious observance or instruction in religious subjects for the purpose of his attending other religious observance or receiving other religious instruction outside the school, and the local education authority shall require that the times set apart in the school for religious observance and instruction shall be arranged so as to facilitate such withholding of scholars.

"(2) In all public elementary schools, whether provided by the local education authority or not, where a reasonable number of parents of scholars attending the school desire that by religions instruction other than that provided by the managers should be given to their children, the local education authority may require that the managers shall (whether the religious instruction is regulated by any trust deed scheme or other instrument or not) make such arrangements as may be practicable, having due regard to the suitability of the buildings and the discipline of the school to allow such other religious instruction to be given in the school.

"(3) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to deprive a parent of any right he possesses under Section 7 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870.

"(4) If any question shall be raised by the local education authority or by the managers of a school as to what is reasonable within the meaning of this section, every such question shall be decided by the Board of Education, and their decision shall be final."—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 407
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 414
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 421
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 423
Sir John Gorst 425
Mr. Lambert (*Devonshire, South Molton*) 428
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 429
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 432
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tunbridge*) 433
Mr. Lloyd-George 436
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 442
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 443

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 576.)

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, further proceedings on consideration, as amended, stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr Bryce 449

New Clause—

"The managers or trustees of any school which by its trust deed is to be used for the purposes of instruction as an elementary school shall at the request of the local education authority, transfer the school buildings to that authority either by way of lease for a term of years renewable for ever or absolutely, pursuant to section twenty-three of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, upon such terms regarding rent or purchase-money as may be agreed between the trustees and the local education authority, or, in default of agreement, fixed by the Board of Education, regard being had to the purposes for which under the trust deed the buildings may be used, to the sources whence the sums expended on the buildings were derived, and to the rights of user reserved to the trustees. Provided that such managers or trustees may reserve out of such transfer to trustees, to be nominated by them for that purpose, the use of the school buildings when the same are not being used for school purposes, and may provide for the giving of any religious instruction, over and above that which may be given by the teachers, either before the opening or after the close, or both before the opening and after the close, of the ordinary school hours, under the direction either of the hereinbefore mentioned trustees, or of such person or persons as the last hereinbefore mentioned trustees may from time to time appoint."—*Mr. Bryce.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Sir William Anson 453
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 455
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 457
Mr. Yoxall 458
Mr. Bryn Roberts (*Carnarvonshire, Eifion*) 460
Mr. Lloyd-George 461
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 462

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 102 ; Noes, 196. (Division List No. 577.)

Mr. Channing 465

New Clause—

"The Council of a county or county borough, or of any borough with a population of over ten thousand, or of any urban district with a population of over twenty thousand, may, after such notices and under such regulations as the Board of Education shall prescribe, determine by resolution that any existing School Board within the county, or the existing School Board in any county borough, or in any borough with a population of over ten thousand, or urban district with a population of over twenty thousand, as the case may be, shall be the

local education authority for the purposes of Part III. of this Act, within the area for which such School Board was formed, and thereupon such School Board shall have throughout their area, in respect of Part III. of this Act, all the powers and duties of a local education authority under this Act as hereinafter provided."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 467
Dr. Macnamara 468
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 470

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 578.)

Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 473

New Clause—

"It shall be a condition of every public elementary school not provided by a local education authority that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school, except during the last half-hour of the school meeting, and then only to those children whose parents have expressed in writing to the managers of the school a desire that such catechism or formulary shall be taught to their children.

"Provided that no bye-law shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects, or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parents belong."—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 210. (Division List No. 579.)

It being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr, SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to Parts I. and II. of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to insert as a new sub-Section, the words '(2) A Council, in exercising their powers under this Part of the Act, shall have regard to any existing supply of efficient schools or colleges, and any steps already taken for the purposes of higher education under the Technical Instruction Acts, 1889 and 1891.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 580.)

Nov. 25.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 17, to leave out the words 'or college,' and insert the words 'college or hostel' instead thereof."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question, "That the words 'or college' stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Question put, "That the words 'college or hostel' be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 213; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 581.)

Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, Otley) 485

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out Clause 5."—(*Mr. Duncan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the Clause, to the word 'secular,' in page 3, line 2, stand part of the Bill."

Sir William Anson 489

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 582.)

Further consideration, as amended, adjourned till To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow 491

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 26TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Buxton, against; to lie upon the Table 493

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition from New Brompton, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 493

Nov. 26.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEW SOUTH WALES (WOMEN'S FRANCHISE ACT, 1902).—Copy presented, of the Women's Franchise Act, 1902 (New South Wales) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 382.] 493

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2915 to 2917 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 494

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 585 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 494

CASUALTIES TO STEAM BOILERS (MERCANTILE MARINE)—Return ordered, of casualties to steam boilers in the British Mercantile Marine during the five years ending the 31st day of December, 1901, in the following form :—

Name and type of boiler.	Estimated number of boilers in use.	Number of Casualties.	Number of persons killed.	Number of persons injured.	Remarks.
Fire tube - - - -					
Water tube (modern) -					
Water tube of the Haystack type - - -					

—(*Lord Charles Beresford*) 494

CASUALTIES TO STEAM BOILERS (UNITED KINGDOM).—Return ordered, of casualties to steam boilers used on shore in the United Kingdom during the five years ending the 31st day of December, 1901, in the following form :—

Name and type of boiler.	Estimated number of boilers in use.	Number of casualties reported under the Boiler Explosions Act.	Number of persons killed.	Number of persons injured.	Remarks.
Types other than water tube - - - -					
Water tube - - -					

—(*Lord Charles Beresford*) 493

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PROPOSED RE-ORGANISATION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.—Question, Mr. David Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil): Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 493

TREATY OF UPSALA, 1654—STAMP DUTIES ON BRITISH INSURANCE POLICIES IN SWEDEN.—Question, Mr. Guthrie (Tower Hamlets, Bow); Answer, Lord Cranborne 495

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—OPERATORS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 495

STAFFORD POSTAL STAFF—ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Charles Shaw (Stafford); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 496

Nov. 26.]

Page

EXTENSION OF RAILWAY IN TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Hertfordshire, Hitchin); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 496

IMPORTATION OF DOGS—RABIES.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 496

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN—PENRUDDOCKE CASE—SUGGESTED ALTERATION OF LAW.—Question, Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 497

PENRUDDOCKE CASE—SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF MR. PENRUDDOCKE'S NAME FROM ROLL OF MAGISTRATES.—Question, Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 497

COMMITTEE ON VENTILATION OF FACTORIES.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 498

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY—VIBRATION.—Question, Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour... 498

ANNUAL LEAVE AND FREE PASSES HOME FOR MEN ON ACTIVE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 498

WOOLWICH ARSENAL—DISCHARGE OF WORKMEN—OUTPUT OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 499

EDUCATION BILL—VOLUNTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Colonel Blundell (Lancashire, Ince); Answer, Sir William Anson 500

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOLDIERS DISCHARGED IN SOUTH AFRICA—INDUCEMENTS TO SETTLEMENT IN NEW COLONIES.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. Georges); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 500

PROVISIONAL REGIMENT OF DRAGOONS—CASE OF EX-SERGEANT LEONARD.—Question, Mr. Butcher (York); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 501

TATTOO AND ROLL CALLS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 502

CHINA SQUADRON—BRITISH NORTH BORNEO COAL.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 502

INDIA—CONDUCT OF 9TH LANCERS AT SIALKOTE.—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 502

INDIAN CUSTOMS AND MILITARY ACCOUTREMENTS.—Question, Lord Alwyne Compton (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade); Answer, Earl Percy 503

SECRET TREATIES WITH FOREIGN POWERS.—Question, Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 503

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY—TOW ROPING AT AYTON STATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 504

Nov. 26.] *Page*

SCOTTISH HARBOURS—GRANTS IN AID.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 505

SMALL HOLDINGS ACT, 1892.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 505

ADMISSION OF PRISONERS TO BAIL.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines) 506

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN—PENRUDDOCKE CASE.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 506

BRITISH NORTH BORNEO MAILS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 507

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN BROAD BAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 508

IRISH POST OFFICE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 508

BELFAST TELEGRAPH OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 508

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS.—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 509

SOLICITORS AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 509

BELFAST TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 509

IRISH REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 510

DROMORE DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 510

IRISH DISPENSARY MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 511

CASE OF MICHAEL FAHY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 511

IRISH DICTIONARY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 512

EDUCATION BILL — DEFINITION OF "EDUCATION." — Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 512

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF WELSH INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 513

THE CUNARD SUBSIDY.—Questions, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 513

Page

1903 SESSION.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 514

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. Causton (Southwark, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 514

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 515

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 2, to leave out the word 'secular.'"—(*Mr. George White.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'secular' stand part of the Bill"

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 518
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 520
Mr. Lucas (Portsmouth.) 524
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 525
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 526
Mr. Platt-Higgins (Salford, N.) 526

Question put.

"That the word 'secular' stand part of the Clause."

The House divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 583.)

Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 529

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 15, at beginning of sub-Section (2), to insert the words: 'Except in areas where there appears to the local education authority to be only one school available for children resident in such area.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 534
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 536
Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.) 539
Sir Charles Dilke 540
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 542
Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud) 543
Col. Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) 544
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) 545
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) 547
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 547
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 550
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) 550
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 552
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid) 553
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 553

Page

Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 554
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 555
Mr. Toulmin (*Lancashire, Bury*) 556
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) 558
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 559
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 560
Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 561

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 117 ; Noes, 209. (Division List No. 584.)

Mr. Rickett (*Scarborough*) 565

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'four,' and insert the word 'two.'"—(*Mr. Compton Rickett.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'four' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Fuller (*Wiltshire, Westbury*) 568
Sir William Anson 568
Mr. Bryce.... 569
Mr. Theodore Taylor (*Lancashire, Radcliffe*) 572

It being half-past seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill. As amended, further considered.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [this day] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'four,' and insert the word 'two' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Compton Rickett.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'four' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Theodore Taylor 573
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*)... 574
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 576
Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 579
Dr. Macnamara 581
Mr. Tomkinson (*Cheshire, Crewe*) 585
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 587
Col. Nolan (*Galway, N.*) 587
Mr. Alexander Cross (*Glasgow, Camlachie*) 589

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 97. (Division List, No. 585.)

Nov. 26.] *Page*

Amendments made—

"In Clause 7, page 3, line 34, leave out 'so long as,' and insert 'but.' In Clause 7, page 3, line 35, after 'them,' insert 'only so long as.' In Clause 7, page 3, line 41, and page 4, line 1, leave out 'with respect to,' and insert 'for.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 591

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 6, to leave out sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir William Anson 592
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 593

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lambert 593

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out the words 'the consent of.'"—(*Mr. Lambert.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir William Anson 596
Mr. Joseph A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 596

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 178; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 586.)

Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 599

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out the words 'Provided that assistant teachers and pupil teachers may be appointed if it is thought fit,' and insert the words 'the appointment of teachers shall be made from among persons willing to teach in the school.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir William Anson 604
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 604
Mr. Bryce 604
Mr. Bull (*Hammersmith*) 606

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 69; Noes, 168. (Division List No. 587.)

It being after midnight, further consideration, as amended, stood adjourned till Tomorrow.

Nov. 26.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 2 :—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed ... 608

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA, 1902.—Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into sentences passed under Martial Law [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 609

EAST INDIA (OPIUM).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 20th November; *Mr. Henry J. Wilson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 383.] 609

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.—Copy presented, of forty minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning Forms of Instruction for certain County Boroughs, Counties and Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 609

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2918 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 609

ALTERATIONS IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.—Address for "Return showing (1) the names of those present at the Conference on the 28th day of February, 1894, of Representatives of the King's Printers and the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge to consider proposed Alterations in the Printing of the Prayer Book; (2) a list of all the alterations in the Printing of the Prayer Book then arranged; and (3) the authority under which the three Presses took action."—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*) 609

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

HACKNEY DOWNS RAILWAY ACCIDENT—INTERCOMMUNICATION APPARATUS. Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 609

COASTGUARDS, ILFRACOMBE DIVISION—ALLEGED NEGLECTFUL LOOK-OUT.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 610

Nov. 27.] Page

COAL DUTY—DECREASED IMPORT OF BRITISH COAL INTO RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour ... 610

VACCINATION—FEES FOR EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 611

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN — PENRUDDOCKE CASE — ALTERATION OF LAW—REMOVAL OF MR. PENRUDDOCKE'S NAME FROM ROLL OF MAGISTRATES.—Questions, Captain Greville (Bradford, E.), and Mr. Hogg (Sussex, Eastbourn); Answers, Mr. Akers Douglas 612

COST OF TRAINING SEAMEN.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 613

ALLEGED DISHONESTY OF A GLASGOW LAWYER.—Question, Mr. Baird (Glasgow, Central); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 613

PROMOTION IN THE CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 614

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISORS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 614

BILBAO HARBOUR LIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Cranborne ... 615

VOLUNTEER LONG SERVICE MEDAL—SUGGESTED ALTERATIONS.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 615

RESERVE OF OFFICERS—GRATUITIES.—Question, Col. Brookfield (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 616

1ST INNISKILLING FUSILIERS—RETURN HOME.—Question, The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 616

EXTRA WAR GRATUITY—PARTICIPATION BY OFFICERS.—Question, The Master of Elibank; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 617

OFFICERS SERVING ABROAD—EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX.—Question, Mr. Groves (Salford, S.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 617

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

WAR REWARDS FOR VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 617

CIVIL SURGEONS AND THE WAR GRATUITY.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 618

ARTILLERY VOLUNTEER ADJUTANTS.—Question, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire); Answer, Lord Stanley 619

COLONIAL ALLOWANCES TO OFFICERS SERVING IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Llewellyn (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 619

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR TRANSPORTS.—Questions, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); and Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 619

ADMIRALTY LIST OF IRISH LIGHTS.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 620

Nov. 27.] *Page*

Scarcity of Employment.—Questions, Mr. John Burns (Battersea), Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet), Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) and the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 621

Mr. J. A. Kensit.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) and Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 623

Argentine Cattle Trade.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 623

Barvas Medical Officer's Report.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 624

Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 624

Shader (Island of Lewis) Landing Place.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 625

Bagnalstown Police.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 625

Banbridge Board of Guardians.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 626

Longford Guardians — Boarding-out Dispute — Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 626

Horse-Breeding Experiments in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 627

Irish Congested Districts Board Staff.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 627

Corkly Orange Lodge.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 627

Belfast Telegraphists' Grievances.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) ... 628

Railway Rates between Limerick and Liverpool.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 628

Army Contracts in Belfast.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Lord Stanley 629

Brussels Sugar Convention.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), Mr. Gibson Bowles, and Mr. James Lowther; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 630

Education Bill—Position of Transferred Schools.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 631

Education Bill—Clause 23.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.), Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, N.), Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) and Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 631

Page

Osborne Estate Bill.—The Select Committee on the Osborne Estate Bill was nominated of—Mr. Hayes-Fisher; Mr. Solicitor General; and Sir James Woodhouse.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*) 633

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Amendment proposed—

"To omit from Clause 7, page 4, lines 15 and 16, the words 'without reference to religious creed or denomination.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Frederick Wilson (*Norfolk, Mid*) 634

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 18, to leave out the words 'except for the teacher's dwelling house.'"—(*Mr. Frederick Wilson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (*Sir William Anson, Oxford University*) 635
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 637
Sir James Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) 638
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 640
Mr. Groves (*Salford, S.*) 641
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 642
Mr. Purvis (*Peterborough*) 643
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 644
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 644
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 646
Mr. Luke White (*Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose*) 647
Mr. Kemp (*Lancashire, Heywood*) 648

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 179; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 588.)

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 7, page 4, line 20, leave out from 'school' to 'and,' in line 23. In Clause 7, page 4, line 27, at end, insert as a fresh paragraph—'(*e*) The managers of the school shall, if the local educational authority have no suitable accommodation in schools provided by them, allow that authority to use any room in the schoolhouse out of school hours free of charge for any educational purpose, but this obligation shall not extend to more than three days in the week.'" "In Clause 7, page 4, line 28, after 'school,' insert 'maintained but.'" "In Clause 7, page 4, line 28, make lines 28 to 37, being paragraph (*e*) of sub-Section (1), a new sub-Section (2)." "In Clause 7, page 4, line 39, after 'school,' insert 'not provided by the authority.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 651

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out sub-Section (4) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'religious instruction' stand part of the Bill."

Sir Robert Finlay 659
Mr. Asquith (Fife, E.) 665
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 672
Mr. Lyttelton (Warwick, Leamington) 678
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (Kent, Tunbridge) 681
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 682
Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) 686
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 688
Col. Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 694
Mr. Wanklyn (Bradford, Central) 697
Sir Richard Jebb (Cambridge University) 698
Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 699

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [this day] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was, in page 5, line 6, to leave out sub-section (4) of Clause 7.—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'religious instruction' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Milvain (Hampstead)... 700
Mr. Guthrie (Tower Hamlets, Bow) 701
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 701
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 702
Sir William Harcourt 704
Mr. A. J. Balfour 719

Question put.

The House divided. Ayes, 294; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 589.)

Amendment proposed—

In Clause 7, page 5, line 9, at end, add as a new sub-Section—(5) The managers of a school maintained but not provided by the local education authority shall have all powers of management required for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall (subject to the powers of the local education authority under this Section) have the exclusive power of appointing and dismissing teachers."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

It being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to Part III. of the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 22, at end to insert as a fresh sub-Section the words—'(2) If, in the opinion of the Board of Education, any enlargement of a public elementary school is such as to amount to the provision of a new school, that enlargement shall be so treated for the purposes of this Section.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 223 ; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 590.)

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 10, page 6, line 4, at end, insert 'which, in cases where part only of a parish is situated in the area of the local education authority shall be apportioned in such manner as the Board of Education think just.'"

"In Clause 10, page 6, line 15, after 'elementary,' insert 'day.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 6, line 33, to leave out the words 'Before such order is made, reasonable.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 98 ; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 591).

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, leave out 'thereof,' and insert 'of any such application.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, after 'draft,' insert 'final.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, after 'order,' insert 'proposed to be made thereon.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 36, leave out 'or,' and insert 'and.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 38, at end of line, insert 'and the final order shall not be made until six weeks after notice has been so given.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 16, at end, to add as a new sub-section the words —'(6) The Board of Education may, on the application of the managers of the school, the local education authority, or any person appearing to them to be interested in the school, revoke, vary or amend any order made under this section by an order made in a similar manner ; but before making any such order the draft thereof shall, as soon as may be, be laid before each House of Parliament, and if within thirty days, being days on which Parliament has sat, after the draft has been so laid before Parliament, either House resolves that the draft, or any part thereof, should not be proceeded with, no further proceedings shall be taken thereon, without prejudice to the making of any new draft order.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Nov. 27.] Page

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 592.)

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 17, page 8, line 14, leave out 'local,' and insert 'public.'"

"In Clause 14, page 8, line 16, leave out 'a local,' and insert 'such an.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Further consideration, as amended, adjourned till tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, FRIDAY, 28th NOVEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS.)—Return for the month of October, 1902. 741

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND.)—Report and Tables relating to Irish migratory agricultural and other labourers, for the year 1902. 741

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 2918. Switzerland 741

SOUTH AFRICA.—Report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into sentences passed under martial law 741

COLONIES—ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 372. British Solomon Islands. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 741

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1399.—Forty minutes sanctioning forms of instruction for certain county boroughs, counties, and urban districts. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 741

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, 28th NOVEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, "That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)... ... 741

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petition from New Brompton, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table 741

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Helmshore; Crawshawbooth; Chadderton; General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland; Hazelgrove; and Cheadle; to lie upon the Table... 742

Page

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration : from Speldhurst ; and New Brompton ; to lie upon the Table 742

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Bromfield in favour ; to lie upon the Table 742

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour : from Kilarrow ; and Kilchoman ; to lie upon the Table 742

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS.)—Copy presented of Return of Proceedings during the month of October, 1902 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 742

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND.)—Copy presented of Agricultural Statistics of Ireland, with Report and Tables relating to Irish Migratory Agricultural and other Labourers for the year 1902 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 742

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented of Report No. 372 (British Solomon Islands, Report for 1901–2) [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 742

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) ; Answer, Lord Cranborne 742

TRAINING OF POOR LAW CHILDREN—UTILISATION OF COUNTY COUNCIL TECHNICAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 743

EDUCATION BILL—CONTINUOUS LIABILITIES OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield) ; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 744

EDUCATION BILL—IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE FUNDS OF EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse ; Answer, Mr. Walter Long ... 744

DONEGAL TRUNK TELEPHONE SERVICE. -Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 745

ABOYNE (ABERDEENSHIRE) POSTMISTRESS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 745

LONDON TELEPHONES—POST OFFICE AND NATIONAL COMPANY'S SYSTEMS.—Question, Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 746

TRANSVAAL LIQUOR ORDINANCE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Burghs) ; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain... 747

IRISH LIGHTS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty ; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour ... 747

BUNCRANA-CARNDONAGH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty ; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 747

ICHTHYOLOGICAL COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Question, Sir H. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth) ; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 748

SCOTLAND—EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN BARS.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) ; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 748

NAVAL BOILERS—REPORT OF RECENT EXPERIMENTS.—Question, Col. Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Mr. Arnold Forster 748

RIDING BICYCLES ON FOOTPATHS—BURNFOOT PROSECUTIONS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 748

ARMY PENSIONS—PROPOSED WEEKLY PAYMENTS.—Question, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 749

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. Rigg (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 749

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 9, line 14, to leave out the words from the word 'committees' to the end of the Clause, and insert the words 'consisting of members of the Council who shall have power to co-opt other persons of both sexes to serve on such education committee or committees, but the total number of such co-opted members shall be less than half the total number of members, and any Council may delegate to such committee such of its powers as it thinks fit.'"—(*Mr. Rigg.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 15, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 751
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 754
The Secretary of the Board of Education (*Sir William Anson, Oxford University*) 755
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 757
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 758
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 759
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 759
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 762
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 763
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 763
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*)... 765
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 768
Mr. Kemp (*Lancashire, Heywood*)... 770
Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley*) 770

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Charles Dilke 771

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 9, line 14, to leave out the words from the word 'Committees' to the word 'Provided,' in line 16."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 15, stand part of the Bill."

The Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 772
Mr. Bryce 772

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 143; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 593.)

Nov. 28.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 18, page 9, line 19, leave out 'appoint,' and insert 'establish.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 773

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 18, page 9, line 33, after 'unless,' insert 'in the case of a county.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Sir Robert Finlay 775

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Henry Hobhouse 775

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 35, to insert, after the word 'desirable,' the words 'to the council.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 775
Sir William Anson 776
Mr. Bryce 777
Mr. A. J. Balfour 779
Sir John Dorrington (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 781
Mr. Ernest Gray 782
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 782
Sir James Rankin (*Staffordshire, Handsworth*) 783

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 81; Noes, 155. (Division List No. 594.)

Mr. Humphreys Owen 783

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 6, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'unless the council otherwise determine.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Henry Hobhouse 787
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.*) 787
Mr. Ernest Gray 787
Mr. Lloyd-George 788

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 8, at end, to insert the words 'but no such person shall vote on any question relating to the salary or conditions of employment of any member of the teaching staff in any school aided, provided, or maintained by the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Nov. 28.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Walter Long 788
Mr. Lloyd-George 789
Mr. Humphreys-Owen 789

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Yoxall 789

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 12, at the beginning to insert the words 'Provided that the proper co-ordination of all forms of education under Parts II. and III. of this Act is adequately secured.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir William Anson 790

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Duncan (*Yorkshire, W. R. Otley*) 790

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 19, at the end of sub-section (4), to insert the words 'Provided that no scheme made by the Board of Education shall provide for the constitution of a separate education committee for any area within the country, or for a Joint Committee as aforesaid, unless with the consent of the County Council.'"—(*Mr. Duncan.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Charles Dilke 791
Mr. Bryce 791
Sir William Anson 791

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir William Anson 792
Mr. Yoxall 792
Mr. Lloyd-George 792

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Page 10, line 24, to leave out sub-section (*b*) of Clause 18."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir William Anson 794
Mr. Bryce 794

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 175 ; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 595.)

It being after half-past Four of the clock, Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to the remaining portion of the Bill.

Nov. 28.]

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 8, after 'fit' insert '(after giving reasonable notice to the overseers of the parish or parishes concerned).'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 21, after 'expenditure,' insert 'or rent.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 28, after 'loans insert 'or rent.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 33, leave out 'the annual,' and insert 'any.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 20, page 15, line 16, after 'a,' insert 'county borough.'"

"In Clause 20, page 12, line 25, after 'county borough,' insert 'borough.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 33, to leave out the words 'control or.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the words to be left out stand part of the Bill.

The House divided:—Ayes, 78, Noes, 172. (Division List No. 596.)

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 22, page 13, line 29, leave out 'as a,' and insert 'and] having the same effect as an original.'" 48]

"In Clause 22, page 13, line 19 and 20, leave out 'for Establishing an Education Committee under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 13, line 25, to leave out the word 'elementary,' and insert the words 'instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as prescribed by regulations to be made by the Board of Education for the purpose."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the word 'elementary' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 77; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 597.)

Words inserted in the Bill.

Amendments proposed—

> "In Clause 23, page 13, line 33, at end, add, 'Provided that the local education authority may with the consent of the Board of Education extend those limits in the case of any such school if no suitable higher education is available within a reasonable distance of the school.'"
>
> "In Clause 23, page 13, line 33, add as a new sub-Section, '(3) The power to supply or aid the supply of education other than elementary includes a power to train teachers, and to supply or aid the supply of any education except where that education is given at a public elementary day school or at evening schools which are elementary schools.'"—*(Sir William Anson.)*

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 23, page 14, line 2, after 'appointment,' insert 'of managers.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 14, line 13, at the end, to insert, as a new sub-Section the words, '(8) In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'trust deed' includes any instrument regulating the trusts or management of a school.'"—*(Sir William Anson.)*

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 164; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 598.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 23, page 14, line 25, leave out 'act or.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 23, page 14, lines 26 and 27, leave out 'as regards,' and insert 'which relates only to.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 23, page 14, line 32, at end, add as a new sub-Section —'(12) The Board of Education may, if they think fit, hold a public inquiry for the purpose of the exercise of any of their powers or the performance of any of their duties under this Act, and section seventy-three of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, shall apply to any public inquiry so held, or held under any other provision of this Act.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 14, line 34, after 'relating to,' insert 'education committees and managers, and to.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 14, line 31, leave out 'to any area for which Part III. of this Act is adopted,' and insert, 'and other enactments referred to in that schedule.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 15, line 1, leave out all after 'schedule,' to end of Clause."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 26, page 15, line 13, leave out 'twelve' and insert 'eighteen.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 26, page 15, line 16, leave out 'local education authorities' and insert 'councils.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 1, page 16, line 35, after 'Chairman' insert 'of the meeting.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 18, line 13, leave out 'that fund' and insert 'the proper fund or account.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 18, line 39, at end, insert, as a fresh paragraph—(9) The disqualification of any persons who are, at the time of the passing of this Act, members of any Council and who will become disqualified for office in consequence of this Act shall not, if the Council so resolve, take effect until a day fixed by the Resolution, not being later than the next ordinary day of retirement of councillors in the case of a County Council, the next ordinary day of election of councillors in the case of the Council of a borough, and the 15th day of April in the year 1904 in the case of an Urban District Council."

Amendment agreed to.

Nov. 28.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 20, line 27, at end, add 'and if any compensation is payable otherwise than by way of an annual sum, the payment of that compensation shall be a purpose for which a Council may borrow for the purposes of this Act."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 3, page 20, line 35, after 'act,' insert 'except as respects transactions before the appointed day and.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 3, page 21, line 33, after 'shall,' insert 'Unless the context otherwise requires.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out the words 'sections fifteen and.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question put, "That the word 'section' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 65 ; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 600).

Words inserted in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 22, line 17, insert 'sections fifteen and.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 22, line 30, after 'fifty-one' insert 'in section fifty-two in the words "under the provisions of this Act with respect to the appointment of a body of managers."'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 23, leave out lines 11, 12, and 13."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock until Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 1st DECEMBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.—Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off from the total amount of notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act, and ordered to lie on the Table 813

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Thursday next.—(*The Lord Balfour.*) (No. 190) 813

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—Read 3^{a} (according to order), with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 813

SCHOOL TEACHING OF COLONIAL HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY—PROPOSED "EMPIRE DAY."

Earl of Meath 813
The President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 821

PRIVILEGE—THE LORDS AND MONEY BILLS—THE FINANCIAL CLAUSES OF THE EDUCATION BILL.

Earl Spencer 823
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Halsbury*) 826
Lord Davey 830
The Lord President of the Council (*The Duke of Devonshire*) 831
Lord Davey 831
Earl of Camperdown 832
Lord Tweedmouth... 832

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till Tomorrow half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 1ST DECEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Skipton, against alteration; to lie upon the Table 834

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES BILL.—Petition from Forest Hill against alteration to lie upon the Table — 834

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Nash Manor, and Llanvihangel; to lie upon the Table 834

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.—Copy presented of Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off on the 17th day of November, 1902, from the total amount of notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 834

Dec. 1.] *Page*

VACCINATION.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February (*Mr. Grant Lawson*)]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 384.] ... 835

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS NOT UNDER TRUST DEEDS.—Question, Mr. Brassey (Oxfordshire, Banbury); Answer, Sir William Anson 835

EDUCATION BILL—POSITION OF TEACHERS TRANSFERRED TO SCHOOLS UNDER LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—Question, Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, (Wiltshire, Cricklade); Answer, Sir William Anson 835

DINGLE LICENSING CASE.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 836

MEDITERRANEAN SQUADRON—RANKING OF INSPECTORS OF MACHINERY.—Question, Mr. Platt-Higgins (Salford, N.); Answer; Mr. Arnold-Foster ... 836

KOBE (JAPAN) TRADE REPORT.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Cranborne 837

RUSSIAN RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN CHINA.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Lord Cranborne 837

ISLAND OF LEWIS SANITATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A Graham Murray 837

ISLAND OF LEWIS—PROPOSED DRY DOCK AT LOCK HOLM.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 838

JUBALAND EXPEDITION, 1901—BATTA FOR INDIAN TROOPS.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 838

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY—ACCIDENT AT WESTBOURNE PARK.—Question, Mr. Philipps (Pembroke); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 839

IRISH DICTIONARIES AT POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 839

LIVERPOOL FEMALE POSTAL EMPLOYEES GRIEVANCES.—Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 839

POSTAL CIRCULATION OF LOTTERY AND GAMBLING CIRCULARS.—Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 840

NAVAL GUNNERY—REWARDS FOR PROFICIENCY.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 840

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TELEPHONES.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 841

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 841

MIDLAND GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND—CANAL TRAFFIC TOLLS.—Question, Mr. Kennedy (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 842

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 842

Dec. 1.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BRITISH TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 843

BRITISH ARMY HEADQUARTERS IN NATAL.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 843

WAR GRATUITIES TO CIVIL VETERINARY SURGEONS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 843

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY BILL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 843

AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Mr. Kimber (Wandsworth); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 844

INDIAN NATIVE ARMY.—PROMOTION OF COLONELS.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 844

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) ... 845

RUSSIAN CONSULS IN PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Lord Cranborne 845

RAILWAYS IN SOUTHERN PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Lord Cranborne 846

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TELEPHONE DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 846

EDUCATION BILL—GOVERNORS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 847

EDUCATION BILL.—COMPENSATION TO VOLUNTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS NOT ENGAGED BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES; Question, Mr. Causton (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Sir William Anson 847

FEES IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Sir William Anson 847

EDUCATION BILL.—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION—APPEAL TO THE BISHOP.—Question, Mr. Kenyon (Denbigh); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 848

POST OFFICE TELEPHONES IN IRISH RURAL DISTRICTS.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 848

SUNDAY POSTAL DELIVERIES IN HILLSTREET COUNTY ROSCOMMON.—Question, Mr. Tulley (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 849

BUNERANA—CARNDONAGH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Carew (Meath, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover)... ... 849

STATE PURCHASE OF IRISH RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 850

Dec. 1.] *Page*

Sunday Demonstrations at Downpatrick.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … 851

Physical Science and Manual Instruction in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … 851

Newtown Butler Petty Sessions.—Questions, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 851

District Inspector Rogers of Trim.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 852

Dog Poisoning at Ballaghaderreen.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 852

Cost of Extra Police at Tallow.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 852

Glasnevin Lectures on Bee-keeping.—Questions, Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 853

Roscommon Union Hospital.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 853

Irish Poor Law Medical Officers' Holidays.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … 854

Infirm Inmates of Irish Workhouses.—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … … … 854

Education Bill—Teachers' Superannuation.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour … … … … … … … 854

Manuscript Amendments without Notices.—Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour … … … … … … … 855

The New Questions Rule.—Question, Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour … … … … … … … 855

New Member Sworn.—John Cathcart Wason, esquire, for the County of Orkney and Zetland … … … … … … … … 856

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to, Patent Law Amendment Bill, with Amendments … … … … … … … 856

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305] … … … … … 856

Business of the House—Procedure.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) … … … … … … … 856

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Resolutions dealing with the Power of the Speaker to Adjourn the House or Suspend Sitting, Priority of Business, Business in Supply, Private Business, and Quorum of the House, be Standing Orders of the House, and that Standing Orders 4, 5' 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 be repealed."—(*Mr. A. J Balfour.*)

Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) ... 865
Mr. Lough (Islington W.) ... 867

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'it is expedient at this period of the Session, and without further experience of the Resolutions agreed to as Sessional Orders on 17th February, 11th April, 28th April, and 1st May, to consider a proposal that such Resolutions be Standing Orders of the House.'"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'that the Resolutions dealing with' stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 870
Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) ... 875
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ... 877
Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet) ... 881
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) ... 882
Mr. Disraeli (Chester, Altrincham) ... 884
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) ... 886
Col. Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) ... 887
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 888
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) ... 888
Mr. Pierpoint (Warrington) ... 889

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 144; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 601.)

Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 891
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeen, W.) ... 892

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words, 'the power of the Speaker to adjourn the House or suspend Sitting.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Secretary of the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) ... 893
Mr. Brynmor Jones ... 894
Mr. James Lowther ... 895

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 149; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 602.)

Mr. Brynmor Jones ... 897
Mr. Courtney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) ... 898

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'Priority of Business.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Grant Lawson 898
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 899
Mr Yoxall 899

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 147 ; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 603.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 155 ; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 604.)

Resolved, "That the Resolutions dealing with the Power of the Speaker to adjourn the House or Suspend Sitting, Priority of Business, Business in Supply, Private Business, and Quorum of the House, be Standing Orders of the House, and that Standing Orders, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 be repealed."—(*Mr A. J. Balfour.*)

Ordered, That the Standing Orders, as amended, be printed. [No. 385.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).—Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on proposed New Standing Order (Second and Third Readings) [17th February] read, and discharged.—Motion withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).—Order for Further Consideration of Standing Order No. 21 (Order in Debate), as amended, read and discharged.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.) 905

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Local Government (Scotland) Amendment (No. 2) Bill.—Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd March], "That the Bill be now read a second time," read.

The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 905

Order discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill.—Order for Committee read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn 905

Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

Mail Ships Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 906

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [21st October], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Caldwell 906

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Mr. Tully 907
Sir A. Acland Hood (*Somersetshire, Wellington*) 907

Question put, and negatived.

Question again proposed.

Mr. Wyndham 907
Mr. Tully 907

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and Committed for Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2ND, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

China (No. 3) (1902).—Correspondence respecting the evacuation of Shanghae. 909

Treaty Series (No. 15) (1902).—Additional Act modifying the Industrial Property Convention of 20th March, 1883; signed at Brussels, 14th December, 1900. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 909

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896.—Order, dated the 28th November, 1902, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1902 (No. 2). Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 909

House adjourned at Four o'clock, till Tomorrow, Eleven o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 2ND DECEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Glasgow Corporation (Water and General) Order Confirmation.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Glasgow Corporation (Water and General), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland 909

Glasgow Corporation (Water and General) Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Glasgow Corporation (Water and General)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 10th December, and to be printed. [Bill 306.]... ... 909

Dec. 2.] Page

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Kirkwall, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 910

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 910

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.—Copies presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Cumberland, Hertford, and Wilts) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 910

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.—Copy presented, of an Order, dated the 28th November, 1902, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1902 (No. 12) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 910

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Rules approved by the Secretary for Scotland for the reception of Pauper Lunatics into Lunatic Wards in Poorhouses [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 910

TREATY SERIES (No. 15, 1902).—Copy presented, of Additional Act modifying the Industrial Property Convention of 20th March, 1883. Signed at Brussels, 14th December, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 910

CHINA (No. 3, 1902).—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the evacuation of Shanghae [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 910

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IRISH EDUCATION—EQUIVALENT GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 910

O'KEEFE v. WALSH.—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 911

BRIDGERULE NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson 911

BRITISH TRAWLERS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 912

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY FOR LIGHTHOUSE COMMUNICATION.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 912

LONDONDERRY AND LOUGH SWILLY RAILWAY.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 913

FOREIGN BOUNTIES.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Lord Cranborne 913

NEWFOUNDLAND — SUPPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh; Answer, Lord Cranborne 914

PARCELS POST TO SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Col. Wyndham Murray (Bath); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 914

NEWCASTLE WEST UNION LABOURERS' SCHEME.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 914

EDUCATION BILL—POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Col. Wyndham Murray; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 915

Dec. 2.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—REPATRIATION COMMISSIONS.—Questions, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 915

SOUTH AFRICAN CUSTOMS DUTIES—DRAWBACKS FOR SOLDIERS.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 916

NAVY—DESTRUCTION OF DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 917

SANDHURST CADETS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 917

BREAD CONTRACTS FOR IRISH BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 918

PRETORIA FIELD FORCE CANTEEN.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 919

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central 919

LANDLESS COTTARS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Solicitor General (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 921

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN BROAD BAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 922

ARMAGH TELEGRAPH STAFF.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 923

DROMOD PIER.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes-Fisher, Fulham) 923

WATERFORD AND WEXFORD DISPENSARIES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 924

ATHY JURORS LIST.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 924

IRISH LAND BILL.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 925

ALL-BRITISH CABLE IN INDIA.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 925

TRISTAN DA CUNHA ISLANDS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 925

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—EXPENSES.—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of money to be provided by Parliament, of the Expenses of any application under Section 33 of the Fisheries (Ireland) Act, 1842, and all proceedings thereunder consequent thereon, which may become payable under any Act of the present session to amend the Fisheries (Ireland) Acts, 1842 to 1901 (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Wyndham*) ... — 926

Dec. 2.] *Page*

Education (England and Wales) Bill; (Third Reading—First Day's Debate); Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet) 928

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'be,' and add the words 're-committed in respect of Clauses 19 and 20 (Expenses and Borrowing).'"—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 929
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 931
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 932
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 933

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 934

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Walter Long 945
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 956
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 965
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 973
Mr. Wanklyn (Bradford, Central) 980
Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.) 985
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) 987
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 993
Mr. Abel Smith (Hertfordshire, Hertford) 1001

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [2nd December] to Question, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Page
Mr. Abel Smith 1003
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 1005
Sir John Rolleston (Leicester) 1017
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.)... 1017
The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1031
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.)... 1043

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 1902.

THE EARL WALDEGRAVE.—Sat Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Standing Order No. XXXIX., considered (according to order), and suspended for Tomorrow's sitting 1049

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 192)... 1049

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª this afternoon. (No. 191) 1049

House adjourned at a quarter-past Twelve o'clock a.m. tilll half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Edgbaston, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1049

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL.) ..Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 373 (Jamaica, Report for 1901-2) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1049

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CIVIL SERVICE—BOY COPYISTS' EXAMINATIONS—IRISH CENTRES.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1049

INDIAN MILITARY PENSIONS—PAYMENT IN ENGLAND OR INDIA—RATE OF EXCHANGE.—Question, Sir Seymour-King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1050

IRISH LIGHTS—TUNS BANK, LOUGH FOYLE.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1051

Dec. 3.] *Page*

BUNCRANA-CARDONAGH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1051

INDIA—CONDUCT OF 9TH LANCERS AT SIALKOTE.—Question, Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1051

TELEGRAPHISTS' PROMOTIONS IN LONDON CENTRAL OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1052

SOUTH AFRICA—EDUCATION IN THE NEW COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Chapman (Cheshire, Hyde); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlasn 1053

LONDON AND GLOBE FINANCE CORPORATION.—Question, Major Evans-Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1053

DRAFTS FOR THE 9TH LANCERS.—Question, Col. Legge; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1053

LONDON IRISH RIFLE VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1054

EDUCATION BILL—CLAUSE 18 (2)—DATE OF COMING INTO OPERATION.—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, Sir Wm. Anson 1054

EDUCATION BILL—COUNTY COUNCIL RATING FOR SALARIES, ETC.—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1054

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—ARTICLES OF PEACE—BOER PROTEST TO LORD KITCHENER.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davis (Carmarthen Boroughs): Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1055

WAR COMMISSION.—Questions, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester) and Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1055

STRENGTH OF REGULAR ARMY AT HOME.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh; Answer, Lord Stanley 1056

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS AND WAR RECORDS.—Question, Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E. R. Buckrose); Answer, Lord Stanley 1056

ARGENTINA—THE MURDER OF MR. WILLIAM BARNETT.—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) ... 1056

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Sir Wm. Harcourt (Monmouthshire, N.); Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answers, Lord Cranborne... 1057

SUGAR BOUNTIES AND THE SHIPPING TRADE.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds Central) 1059

BATH HOSPITAL DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. Barlow (Somerset, Frome); Answer, Mr. Walter Long (Bristol, W). 1060

"THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."—TERMS OF THE NEW CONTRACT. Question, Captain Norton; Answer, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham). 1061

Dec. 3]

Page

CROFTS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire). ... 1063

LANDLESS COTTARS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray. 1064

TEACHING OF TRADES AND HANDICRAFT IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray. 1064

HIGHER COMMERCIAL EDUCATION IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Sir Charles Renshaw (Renfrewshire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray. 1064

FEVER IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray. 1064

STORNOWAY MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain. 1066

IRISH MARINE STORE DEALERS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover). ... 1066

SWORDS BOROUGH SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham. 1066

PRIVATE BILLS.—Question, Mr. Muir; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasurer (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1067

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, brought up and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 385.]... ... ...

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—[Third Reading Second Day's Debate.] Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed to Question [2nd December], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*)... 1068
Sir Richard Jebb (*Cambridge University*) 1078
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 1085
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burgh*) 1097
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1112
Mr. Plummer (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 1123
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 1126
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 1132
Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 1139

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood Adjourned till this evening.

Dec. 4.] Page

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [2nd December], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Atherley-Jones ... 1142
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) ... 1144
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Kent, Tunbridge) ... 1149
Mr. Wylie (Dumbartonshire) ... 1157
Mr. Asquith (Fife E.) ... 1160
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 1170

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 286; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 605.)

Main question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 246; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 606.)

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the house without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, THURSDAY, 4TH DECEMBER, 1902.

THE EARL OF BELMORE took the Oath ... 1189

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY sat first in Parliament after the death of his father... 1189

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (WATER TUBE BOILERS).—Report of trials of H.M.S. "Sheldrake," H.M.S. "Seagull," H.M.S. "Espiegle," and H.M.S. "Fantome" (with diagrams).... 1189

MERCANTILE CRUISERS.—Report of the Committee on Mercantile Cruisers ... 1189

COLONIES: ANNUAL.—No. 373. Jamaica (Report for 1901–1902) ... 1189

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1901).—Areas, houses, and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities of the counties of (I.) Wilts; (II.) Hertford; (III.) Cumberland ... 1189

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT).—Report of the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, for the year 1901.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 1189

LUNACY (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1857.—Rules approved by His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland for the reception of pauper lunatics into lunatic wards of poorhouses ... 1189

Dec. 4.| *Page*

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) RULES (JERSEY) —Rules made under the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, as extended by the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation (Jersey) Act, 1900 1189

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of scientific adviser in the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required.
Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1189

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition in favour of; of School Board of Birmingham 1190

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition for rejection of, pending reference to the country, of National Council of Evangelical Free Churches. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1190

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.—Moved, "That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in the Committee of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committee."—[The Lord President (*Duke of Devonshire*)]; agreed to 1190

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland), (No. 2) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª tomorrow 1190

Electric Lighting Acts Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Tuesday next 1190

The Education (England and Wales) Bill.—[Second Reading. First Day's Debate.] Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord President of the Council (*The Duke of Devonshire*) 1190

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

Earl Spencer 1208

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now,' and add at the end of the motion, 'this day two months.'"—(*Earl Spencer.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1220
The Earl of Portsmouth 1225
Viscount Llandaff 1230
Lord Monkswell 1234
Viscount Cross 1241
The Lord Bishop of Newcastle 1243
Viscount Midleton 1251
Lord Coleridge 1257
Viscount Goschen 1266
Lord Ribblesdale 1278
The Earl of Camperdown 1290
Lord Harris ... ... — 1299

Further debate adjourned until Tomorrow.

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, till tomorrow Half-Past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 4TH DECEMBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means. ... 1301

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: From Wem; Swansea; and Dunfermline; to lie upon the Table. 1301

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCANTILE CRUISERS.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Mercantile Cruisers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 1301

NAVY (WATER-TUBE BOILERS).—Copy presented, of Report on Trials of H.M.S. "Sheldrake," H.M.S. "Seagull," H.M.S. "Espiègle," and H.M.S. "Fantôme" (with diagrams) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 1301

SUPERANNUATIONS.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st December, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Scientific Adviser in the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are requisite [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 1301

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) RULES (JERSEY).—Copy presented, of Rules made under The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, as extended by the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation (Jersey) Act, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 1302

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT).—Copy presented, of Report of the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 1302

SPIRITS (ABERDEEN, ELGIN, AND INVERNESS).—Return ordered, "for the collection of Aberdeen, Elgin, and Inverness, relating to spirits, giving (1) the stock of spirits in bond at the 31st day of March, 1901; (2) total spirits bonded from the 31st day of March, 1901, to the 31st day of March, 1902; (3) total spirits cleared from bond from the 31st day of March, 1901, to the 31st day of March, 1902."—(*Mr. Gordon.*) 1302

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

RABIES IN DOGS BROUGHT FROM ABROAD.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1302

ISLAND OF LEWIS—WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1303

ROSS-SHIRE ROADS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray ... 1303

HOUSE OF COMMONS—ALTERATIONS IN NEWS ROOM.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1304

PROVISION FOR AGED AUXILIARY POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain... 1304

Dec. 4.] *Page*

AUSTRALIAN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Joseph Howard (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1304

PACIFIC CABLE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1305

SOUTH AFRICA—TRADE MARK FEE.—Question, Mr. Price (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1306

CANADIAN AND AUSTRALIAN BOUNTIES ON BEET SUGAR.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1306

COLONIAL BOUNTIES ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1307

NORTH-EASTERN RAILWAY—HAXEY LEVEL CROSSING.— Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1307

SALMON FISHERIES COMMISSION REPORT.—Question, Mr. Richard Cavendish, (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1307

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles, and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Lord Cranborne ... 1308

NAVY—PRACTICE AMMUNITION—GUNNERY REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1309

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY RETURN.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1309

BLUEJACKETS' CLOTHING.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1309

NAVAL GUNNERY—H.M.S. "EMPRESS OF INDIA."—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1310

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT—SUSCRIPTIONS OF METROPOLITAN BOROUGHS TO THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.—Question, Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1310

ARMY AND NAVY RESERVISTS IN CANTERBURY WORKHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1311

EDUCATION BILL—LIABILITIES OF TRANSFERRED AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson ... 1312

CHINA—POSITION IN YANG-TSZE VALLEY.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1312

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1313

IRELAND—CONDUCT OF POLICE AT GLENVILLE.—Question, Mr. Wm. Abraham (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1313

IRISH TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION—EQUIVALENT GRANT.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N,); Answer, Mr. Wyndham — 1313

IRISH SCHOOL BUILDING GRANTS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1314

Dec. 4 .] *Page*

CHINA OPERATIONS, 1900—MEDALS AND CLASPS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr Broderick 1314

IRISH GOLD ORNAMENTS DISPUTE.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1315

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT.—Question, Mr. Lloyd-Morgan: Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1315

SOLWAY FISHING REGULATIONS.—Question Mr Claude Lowther (Cumberland, Eskdale); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1315

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—PERMIT REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1316

SOLDIERS' PAY IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1316

SOUTH AFRICA BLOCKHOUSES.—Question, Mr Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 1317

ARMY RESERVE.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1317

PROVISIONAL REGIMENT OF DRAGOONS—EX-SERGEANT LEONARD.—Question, Mr. George Faber (York); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1317

NAVAL CADETS—COST OF MESSING.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, S.) 1318

MEDITERRANEAN SQUADRON—RANKING OF INSPECTORS OF MACHINERY.—Question, Sir Wm. Allan (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 1318

NAVAL ENGINEER ARTIFICERS.—Question, Mr. William Allan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1319

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—"COUNTY" CLASS OF CRUISERS.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1319

H.M.S. "CANOPUS."—Questions, Mr. Harmsworth, Sir William Allan, Lord Charles Beresford (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1320

NAVAL GUNNERY—CHINA SQUADRON—ADMIRAL SEYMOUR'S ORDER.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1321

RUSSIA AND GIBRALTAR.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1322

EXPORT OF JAPANESE BEVERAGES FROM KOBE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1322

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answers, Lord Cranborne 1322

RUSSIA AND THE SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1323

LICENSING ACT, 1892—TRANSLATION INTO WELSH.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1324

Dec. 4.] *Page*

INCOME TAX RETURNS.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1324

INTERCOMMUNICATION APPARATUS ON RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1325

MALLAIG RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour ... 1326

MAIL CAR CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Wood (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1326

PARCELS POST FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1326

PENALTIES FOR ILLEGAL TRAWLING.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1327

IRISH LAND—SECOND TERM RENTS.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1327

BOYCOTTING STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1327

OGILBY ESTATE, CO. TYRONE.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1328

ARDGLASS LABOURERS' COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. Woods; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1329

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1329

GLASNEVIN—LECTURES ON BEE KEEPING.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1329

COMPLAINT AGAINST DUBLIN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1330

PRISON TREATMENT OF IRISH MEMBERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1330

ROCK ANGUS LIGHTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1331

WATER GAS IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1332

GALWAY AS A TRANSATLANTIC PORT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1332

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. T. W. Russell and Mr. Tully; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1332

BETTING.—Ordered, That a message be sent to the Lords, to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on Betting, with the proceedings of the Committee, minutes of evidence, etc.—(*Mr. Attorney-General.*) 1333

Dec. 4.] *Page*

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed];

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 387.] 1333

London Water (Re-committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1334
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1335
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1335

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out 'appointed' and insert 'elected.'" —(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1336

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'appointed,' to insert the words 'from among their own members.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Mr. Walter Long 1337

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Walter Long 1337

Amendment proposed.

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out the words from the word 'appointed,' to end of sub-section, and insert the words 'as follows:—Ten by the London County Council; two by the Common Council of the City; two by the Council of each of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Islington, Kensington, Lambeth, St. Pancras, Stepney, and Westminster; one by the Council of each of the other Metropolitan Boroughs; one by the County Council of Essex; two by the Council of the Borough of West Ham; one by the Council of the Urban District of East Ham; one by the Council of the Urban District of Leyton; one by the Council of the Urban District of Walthamstow; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Buckhurst Hill, Chingford, Loughton, Waltham Holy Cross, Wanstead and Woodford; one by the County Council of Kent; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Beckenham, Bromley, Chislehurst and Penge; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Bexley, Dartford, Erith, and Foot's Cray; one by the County Council of Middlesex; one by the Council of the Urban District of Tottenham;

one by the Council of the Urban District of Willesden; one by the Council of the Borough of Ealing and the Councils of the Urban Districts of Acton and Chiswick; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Brentford, Hampton, Hampton Wick, Hanwell, Heston, and Isleworth, Sunbury, Teddington, and Twickenham; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Edmonton, Enfield, and Southgate; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Hornsey and Wood Green; one by the County Council of Surrey; one by the Council of the Borough of Kingston and the Councils of the Urban Districts of East and West Molesey, Esher and the Dittons, Ham and Surbiton; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Barnes, the Maldens and Coombe, and Wimbledon; one by the County Council of Hertfordshire; three by the Conservators of the River Thames; one by the Lee Conservancy Board.'"—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1338
Mr. Walter Long 1339
Mr. Lough 1342
Mr. Cohen (*Islington, E.*) 1346
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 1346
Sir George Bartley (*Islington, N.*) 1348

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (*Wiltshire, Chippenham*)... 1349

Amendment proposed to the Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the word 'ten' and insert the word 'fourteen'"—(*Sir J. Dickson-Poynder*)—(instead thereof.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'ten' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 1356
Sir Edward Vincent (*Exeter*) 1363
Mr. Mellor (*Yorkshire W.R., Sowerby*) 1367
Mr. Walter Long 1369
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 1372
Sir J. Blundell-Maple (*Camberwell, Dulwich*) 1375
Mr. Theodore Taylor (*Lancashire, Radcliffe*) 1378
Mr. D. J. Morgan (*Essex, Walthamstow*) 1381
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 1381
Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, Pudsey*)... 1384
Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 1386

MR. WALTER LONG rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 607.)

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

Dec. 4.] Page

EVENING SITTING.

London Water (Re-committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Captain Norton (Newington, W.)... 1392

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out 'two' and insert 'one'"—(*Captain Norton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of proposed Amendment.

Sir Joseph Dimsdale (London) 1394
Mr. John Burns 1395
Mr. George Whiteley 1396
Mr. Sydney Buxton... 1397
Mr. Walter Long... 1398

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Lough 1398

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, to leave out 'two' and insert 'one.'"—*Mr. Lough.*

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea) 1399
Dr. Macnamara 1401
Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster) 1402
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1402
Sir Robert Mowbray (Lambeth, Brixton) 1402
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) 1403
Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 1403
Mr. Cohen 1403
Mr. Walter Long 1404

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made—

"In line 4, by leaving out the words, 'two by the Council of each of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Islington, Kensington, Lambeth, St. Pancras, Stepney, and Westminster,' and inserting the words, 'one by the Council of each of the Metropolitan Boroughs.'"—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1404

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 6, to leave out the words 'Council of each of the other metropolitan boroughs,' and insert the words 'Councils of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Poplar and Stepney; one by the Councils of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Bethnal Green, Hackney, and Stoke Newington.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Walter Long 1405
Mr. Rea (Gloucester) 1406
Mr. Lough 1409
Mr. Walter Long 1409
Sir H. Campbell Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1409
Mr. Bousfield 1410
Mr. Courtenay Warner 1411
Mr. Corrie Grant ... ...

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 130; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 609).

Mr. Bousfield 1412

Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment—

"In line 8, to leave out 'two' and insert 'one.'"—(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 1413

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) 1415

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 9, to leave out 'one' and insert 'two' by the Councils or Urban Districts of East Ham, Barking and Ilford."—(*Mr. Louis Sinclair.*)

Mr. Walter Long 1415

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Lough 1416

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out lines 9 to 13, and insert—'One by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Buckhurst Hill, Chingford, East Ham, Leyton, Loughton, Waltham Holy Cross, Wanstead and Woodford.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Dec. 4.] Page
Mr. Walter Long 1417
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1417
Mr. Bousfield 1418

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee reported Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXV.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
SECOND YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 20th November, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Correspondence relating to the appeal of the Boer Generals to the civilised world.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Grants for school teachers' houses.

INDIA (SANITARY MEASURES).

Report on sanitary measures in India in 1900–1901. Volume 34.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.

Area, houses and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities of the counties of Berks, Monmouth, Northampton, Cornwall.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT.

Minutes sanctioning subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the counties of Carmarthen (first minute); Glamorgan (twelfth minute); Salop (fifth minute).

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow No. 2). Regulations for degrees in science in public health.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and to be read 2^{a} on Monday next (The Lord President [*Duke of Devonshire*]); and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Message from the Commons for leave for the Lord Welby to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, that the Earl Waldegrave be appointed to take the chair in the Committee of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*); agreed to.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:—

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, on this Clause I have several Amendments, the object of all of which is to carry out what I indicated in the few words I addressed to the House on the occasion of the Second Reading, namely, to provide that the Judicial Committee shall not make Orders, but merely advise the King in Council, which is the proper function of that Committee.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 3, page 3, line 14, to leave out 'the Judicial Committee may order,' and after 'patentee' to insert 'may be ordered by an Order in Council.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): Perhaps I might interpose and say that all the Amendments of my noble and learned friend are of a drafting nature. The Government accepts them, and I would suggest that they be taken *en bloc*.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [H.L.].

Commons' Amendments considered (according to order).

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: The Amendments which have been inserted in the other House are quite in accordance with what was intended by the Bill, and I move that this House do agree with the Commons in their Amendments.

On Question, Commons' Amendments agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from North-West Surrey; South Bristol; and Dunfermline; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Southampton; and Wargrave; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented of Correspondence relating to the Appeal of the Boer Generals to the Civilised World [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.

Copies presented of two Orders in Council giving effect to Rules of Court under The Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (OPIUM).

Address for "Return of Further Correspondence between the India Office and the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 120, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Henry J. Wilson.*)

PARLIAMENT (DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS).

Copy ordered, "of Contract, granted the 15th day of September, 1902, to

Messrs. Wyman and Sons (Limited), for printing and publishing Reports of Debates and Proceedings in Parliament."—(*Mr. Hayes-Fisher.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Liberia—Alleged Outrage on Natives by British Seamen on the "Olenda."

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether any further information has been received at the Foreign Office upon the case of the alleged sjamboking of Kroo boys overboard a British ship off the Liberian cost whereby several of them were drowned.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) No further information has yet been received. Such evidence as has been obtained in no way supports the allegation made against the master of the steamship "Olenda." Sir W. McGregor, the Governor of Lagos, who was on board the vessel at the time, has suggested that possibly the missing Kroo boys referred to may have been three who were carried on from Monrovia to Sierra Leone, two of them having been in Sir W. McGregor's employment, and His Majesty's Consul at Dakar has been instructed to ascertain and report whether this explanation is the correct one.

Channel Fleet—Statistics of Efficient Seamen.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the percentage of seamen who are efficient in ships of the Channel Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is not quite clear from the hon. Member's Question what is the information required. In view, however, of his previous Question of the 18th instant,† the inquiry is understood as referring to the numbers who have passed through the gunnery or torpedo schools. The total number of men of the seamen class in the Channel Fleet (excluding ordinary seamen who are not eligible for gunnery or torpedo ratings) is 1711, and of these 1502, or about 88 per cent., have passed through the schools and hold gunnery or torpedo ratings, from that of seaman qualified in gunnery upwards, whilst 948, or about 55 per cent., hold ratings not lower than those of seaman gunner or seaman torpedo man.

Chatham Naval Barracks.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state when the barracks at Chatham will be ready for the seamen at present accommodated in old ships at that port; what has caused the delay in the completion of the barracks; and whether he has any official Reports showing that there has been a prevalence of lung complaints amongst these men.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The barracks are now ready for occupation, and are complete with the exception of some additional fittings which have been found necessary since the completion of the main contract. The electric lighting, which has been the main cause of the delay, was completed and trial made on 30th October last. The reply to the last part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Deserters and Discharges from the Navy.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will give Returns of the number of men who have deserted, bought their discharge, or left the service at the expiration of their first period during the past twelve months.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) During the twelve months ending 30th September, 1902, 1,423 men deserted from the Royal Navy (710 deserters being recovered during the same period), 520 men purchased their discharge, and 626 men left the service on the expiration of their first continuous service engagement.

Royal Garrison Artillery; Target Practice Seawards.

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state whether the regulation by which officers of the Royal Garrison Artillery may secure accommodation on portguard and coastguard ships to witness target practice still exists; and if so, how many officers have taken advantage of this regulation during the last twelve months.

---

† See preceding volume, page 1228.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The regulation still exists, but no officers appear to have taken advantage of it during the last twelve months.

Search of Postmen—Grievance at Hastings.

MR. FREEMAN-THOMAS (Hastings): To ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that it is the practice to search the pouches of the postmen at Hastings and St. Leonards after each delivery; and in cases where the postmen book off duty at the head office, the searching of pouches is carried out by a clerk in front of the counter in full view of the public; whether this practice is carried out at all offices under his control; and, if not, will he give orders for it to be discontinued at the offices mentioned.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The practice of searching the pouches of postmen after each delivery is according to rule; but the arrangement for this duty at the head office at Hastings is certainly an undesirable one, and it has now been remedied by transferring the duty of booking off to the sorting office and having the pouches examined there. I may add that no official complaint on this subject has been made by any of the postmen concerned.

"Special Leave"—Grievance at Hastings.

MR. FREEMAN-THOMAS: To ask the Postmaster General whether the Tweedmouth Committee decided that the rules *re* special leave, existing at the time they made their Report, viz., March, 1897, were, in their opinion, sufficient; and if he is aware that at that date, and until quite recently, the staff at Hastings and St. Leonards could obtain leave for a few hours upon applying to their respective supervisors, providing a proper substitute was provided; is he aware that this has recently been altered, and the staff now have to make a written application to the postmaster, thereby causing them great inconvenience, and, in some cases where the leave is required unexpectedly at a few hours notice, it is impossible for a written application to reach the postmaster and to be returned in time; and will he give instructions for casual leave books, as at present in use in London and many provincial offices, to be issued at Hastings and St. Leonards.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Tweedmouth Committee stated in their Report that claims had been made by many classes for more frequent relief on Saturday afternoons, and that, while acknowledging the desirability of such facilities being given where the exigences of the services permit, they considered that the granting of them must be a matter of Departmental arrangement. They also stated that it was urged that special leave should always be granted to a postman when able to provide a substitute. They feared that the concession of this claim would not conduce to the good discipline of the service. The amount of special leave to be granted to any officer must be left to the discretion of his superior, and the regulations laid down by the Department appeared to them sufficiently liberal. The postmaster of Hastings considered it desirable that no special leave should be granted without his sanction, and he does not appear to have received any official complaint on the subject. There may be, of course, cases of great urgency, when the superior officer on duty must act on his own responsibility, but apart from this the postmaster's action seems right.

Wages of Postal Officials.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Postmaster General whether, seeing that he has declared that the Post Office should endeavour to keep pace with the increase of wages granted by other employers of labour, that in 1881 a scale of pay was in existence giving £190 per annum to operating telegraphists in London, which scale of pay the Civil Service Commissioners advertised on the papers handed to candidates for employment as telegraphists, and that the maximum salary of an operating telegraphist is now £160 per annum in London, he will state what steps have been taken to assimilate the wages of employees in the Postal Departments to that of other employers.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Tweedmouth Committee were of opinion that a maximum of £160 a year was adequate pay for the general body of telegraphists, and I see no reason for granting a higher scale. I am not aware that the remuneration of employees of the Post Office compares unfavourably with that given by other employers.

Poor Law—Isolated or Scattered Homes.

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can give the names of the unions in England and Wales which have put into operation the principle of isolated or scattered homes for poor law children, with the total number of children so provided for, and the average number of beds provided in each home in each of such unions.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The following statement gives the names of the unions in which the guardians have established isolated or scattered homes for poor law children, and the number of children provided for in each case. I cannot state accurately the average number of beds provided in each home, but the number would usually be about twelve, and would in no case exceed fifteen.

Union.	Number of Children.
Barton Regis	6
Bath	79
Blackburn	91
Bradford, Yorks.	73
Bristol	297
Camberwell	337
Cardiff	198
Cheltenham	33
Chepstow	15
Chester	52
Darlington	19
Daventry	26
Eastbourne	12
Evesham	13
Gloucester	39
Gravesend and Milton	30
Hartismere	11
Hastings	24
Haverfordwest	24
Holywell	10
Huddersfield	19
Keighley	35
Kendal	40
Kingston, Surrey	49
Leeds	35
Lincoln	25
Long Ashton	20
Maidstone	11
Carried forward	1,623
Brought forward	1,623
Middlesbrough	128
Mile End	196
Morpeth	15
Newport, Salop	10
Newton Abbot	18
Plymouth	79
Reading	101
Richmond, Surrey	29
Sheffield	388
Stamford	4
Steyning	6
Stockport	39
Stockton	88
Stow	22
Strood	7
Toxteth Park	73
Warwick	23
Worksop	23
Total	2,872

Provision of the kind referred to has been, or is being, made in the following unions, but I have not at present information as to the number of children to be accommodated in these cases :—Barnstaple, Derby, Hartlepool, Malling, North Bierley, Norwich, Oldham, Pontypool, Rotherham, Wakefield, Wells, Willesden, Great Yarmouth.

Grove Park (Woolwich) Workhouse—Local Government Loan.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has received any further communication from the Greenwich Board of Guardians asking for an interview; if so, what has been his reply, and if he will state his objection to seeing the representatives of the Greenwich Union and of the Deptford Borough Council; and whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, the Local Government Board would be prepared to permit the repayment of the loans in connection with the building of Grove Park Workhouse to be spread over a term of sixty years if the guardians agreed to open it

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have received a communication from the guardians asking for an interview, and the request is receiving my attention. As regards the period for the repayment of the loan referred to, I have already expressed my willingness to allow sixty years for so much of it as is required for the purpose of the site. As regards the remainder, the general question of the period to be allowed in cases of this kind is now under my consideration in connection with the Report of the Select Committee on the Repayment of Loans by Local Authorities.

Argentina—Importation of Diseased Animals.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can now state what progress has been made in the negotiations initiated by the Government of the Argentine Republic to secure the admission of Argentine cattle for slaughter into this country.

(*Answered by Mr Hanbury.*) The representatives of the Argentine Government are now, I think, fully aware of my views as to the measures which should be taken in order to afford further security against the introduction of the foot-and-mouth disease into Argentina and the importation of diseased animals therefrom. It therefore rests with that Government to take the necessary steps to carry those views into effect if they consider it desirable to do so.

South African War—Employment of Veterinary Surgeons not Members of the R.C.V.S.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether any persons have been employed during the late war as veterinary officers or civil veterinary surgeons who were not members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, in the Regular Army, Imperial Yeomanry, Remount Department, or in Transports.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The only cases in which veterinary surgeons who were not members of the Royal College were employed was to accompany horse transports from New Orleans, Montreal, and New South Wales. In these cases graduates of the American or Canadian Colleges were engaged locally, and four of these were subsequently employed in South Africa for a short time. The same remark applies to New South Wales. Three gentlemen who were not members of the Royal College were engaged by the Imperial Yeomanry Committee. None, however, were employed in the Regular Army who were not members of the Royal College

Northumberland Artillery Militia.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it s proposed to retain the headquarters of the Northumberland Artillery Militia at Berwick-on-Tweed; and, if so, what steps are being taken to obtain the necessary camping ground for the recruits of that regiment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) There is no present intention of moving the headquarters of this corps. The question of hiring the camping ground for recruits rests with the General Officer commanding the district, who will take the necessary measures when the land is required.

Nigeria Protectorate—Aro Expedition.

MR. MOON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies the cost of the purchase and transport to South Nigeria of a battery of 12-pounders for the Aro expedition, and the carriage of this battery about a thickly-wooded country by some 150 porters.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) No 12-pounders or other artillery were specially purchased and sent to Southern Nigeria for the Aro expedition. The artillery employed in the expedition consisted of eight guns, namely, four 75-millimetre guns and four 7-pounders, all of which form part of the ordinary armament of the Protectorate. No additional cost was incurred by the carriage of guns in the expedition. The establishment of the Southern Nigeria Regiment of the West African Frontier Force includes the necessary number of gun carriers, who are paid at the rate of 1s. a day.

South Africa—Martial Law Commission's Report.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state when it is expected that the House will be in possession of the Report of the Lord Chief

Justice, as head of the Commission recently sent to South Africa to review the sentences inflicted by the Martial Law Courts in that country.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that it is hoped to publish it at an early date.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Grants to Repatriated Boers.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state how much of the three million pounds free grant to the Boers has been expended, and in how many cases cattle unfit for work or diseased were given to Boer farmers, and to what extent agricultural machinery has been provided for them; and whether steps will be taken to prevent pauperisation.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): I must refer the hon. Member to the answers given to similar Questions on 5th November and 6th November from the hon. Members for South Molton, Chesterfield, and Ross and Cromarty, and to the reply given by the Financial Secretary of the War Office to the hon. Member for South Molton on 11th November.† I have no later information. With regard to the concluding part of the Question, care will be taken to distribute relief to those who have a good claim to it.

Army Examination Text-Books.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Army cadets and officers entering for examinations experience difficulty because officially prescribed text-books are out of print; and whether he will give an assurance that the obstacles thus interposed in the way of officers pursuing their military studies shall be removed.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am aware that certain text-books are under revision owing to changes in Army organisation and duties. Owing to the heavy pressure of the war it has not been found possible to proceed with the revision as rapidly as could be wished, but every effort is being made to push on the work as speedily as possible.

Volunteer Capitation Grants—Camp Leave.

MR. FREEMAN-THOMAS (Hastings): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under Volunteer Regulations issued with the Special Army Order of 22nd April, 1902, all Volunteers who were enrolled before the issue of these Regulations will remain under the conditions under which they enlisted until 1st November, 1904, and earn the full grant of 35s. per man, and be given leave from camp provided they can satisfy their commanding officer that they have a valid excuse, or whether they will come under the provisions of the new regulations.

*MR. BRODRICK: The regulations in respect of exemptions from camp apply only to officers appointed and Volunteers enrolled before the issue of Army Order 246 of 1901.

Armament of the New Cruisers.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithnessshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the new cruisers of the "County" class are only armed with fourteen 6-inch guns, and that their displacement is 9,800 tons, he will consider the advisability of heavier armaments in their case.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): This matter has been most carefully considered by the Admiralty, and it is not intended to alter the armaments in question.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): May I ask whether it is not the fact that these ships cannot bear any heavier guns on account of their lack of stability?

---

† See preceding volume, pages 137, 265, 591.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I cannot give an answer to a technical question. The whole matter has been before the Admiralty, and it has been decided to make no change.

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state what guns are to be the armament of the cruisers of 13,500 tons displacement, tenders for which have recently been received by the Admiralty.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question of the most suitable armament for the new cruisers is receiving the careful consideration of the Admiralty; and no announcement with respect to it can be made at the present time.

Navy Rations.

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the date, or the approximate date, when the new system of rations will be introduced in the Navy.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am unable to give the date at present, but I hope I may be able to inform the House early next session.

H.M.S. "Medusa."

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what have been the results of the trials of the Durr water-tube boilers as fitted at Jarrow into H.M.S. "Medusa"; and what has been the total amount spent in connection with the vessel, and including the cost of these boilers.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The trials of the Durr boilers of the "Medusa" by the Boiler Committee will not commence until the middle of January next, and will probably extend over a period of three months. Until the full information obtained on these trials has been reported to the Admiralty, the results of the working of the boilers cannot be given. The preliminary steaming has been satisfactory. The total cost of new Durr boilers for the "Medusa," removing the old boilers, and making the necessary alterations and repairs of ship and machinery, is £65,000.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Dear me!

H.M.S. "Good Hope."

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state for what purpose boarding pikes were recently issued to H.M.S. "Good Hope"; and if he can see his way to stop the issue of these weapons.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Boarding pikes are issued, not as weapons, but for use for miscellaneous purposes on board ship. As they are found to be useful, it is considered preferable to continue to issue those now in stock rather than to break them up or sell them. No fresh stock is being provided.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Cannot they be used for gardening purposes?

Indentured Labour in the West Indies and British Guiana.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the importation of indentured labour into the West Indies and British Guiana continues; and, if so, what number of labourers have been imported during each of the last five years.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): The answer to the hon. Member's Question is that the importation of indentured labour into British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica continues. The number of indentured immigrants imported into the British West Indies and British Guiana in each of the last five years has been as follows: 1897, 3045; 1898, 3648; 1899, 6724 1900, 7136; 1901, 7390.

Currency Questions in British East Africa and Uganda.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the transmission of Indian bank notes from British East Africa and Uganda to India, and the consequent reduction in the available currency, and in order to prevent the absence of paper money as well as of gold money placing difficulties in the way of trade, he will provide for the issue of local bank notes at an early date.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The attention of His Majesty's Government has been drawn to this matter. A draft Order in Council providing for the issue of Government paper currency in the East Africa Protectorate is at present under consideration.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: And as to Uganda?

LORD CRANBORNE: I will get information as to that tomorrow.

British North Borneo—Railway to the Interior.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet in a position to say when the new railway from Jesseltown to the interior of British North Borneo will be completed and open for traffic.

LORD CRANBORNE: The railway is still twelve miles short of its interior terminus. The whole line (110 miles) should be open for traffic by the end of next year. At present ninety-five miles are open to traffic.

British Sugar Refineries.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state how many sugar refineries are now working in Great Britain, and how many tons of sugar were refined in this country during the years ending 31st March 1902, 1901, 1891, 1881, and 1871.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am informed that there are eleven sugar refineries now working in Great Britain, exclusive of makers of glucose, invert and other brewing sugars. The quantities of sugar refined in this country cannot be precisely stated for years ending 31st March, but the following figures have been supplied to me showing the approximate quantities refined in certain calendar years. 1902 (estimated quantity) 625,000 tons; 1901, 628,000 tons; 1891, 700,000 tons; 1881, 825,000 tons; 1871 600,000 tons.

Welsh Sunday Closing—Bogus Clubs.

MR. KENYON (Denbighshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the effect on existing powers under the Welsh Sunday Closing Act of the Licensing Act, 1902, especially as regards clubs; and whether, with a view to assisting efforts now being made to bring bogus clubs under the notice of the police and licensing authorities, he will issue a special notice in Welsh and English explanatory of the provisions of both Acts, to the justices and police authorities in Wales; and whether he can hold out any hope that in the next Session he will be prepared to introduce a Bill to prevent evasions of the Sunday Closing Act.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.): I do not think that the Welsh Sunday Closing Act is directly affected by the provisions in the new Licensing Act with regard to clubs; but I hope that the new Act, may, even if indirectly, prove of assistance to the other. I have issued to justices and the police throughout the country circulars, explaining the new Act, and I do not think that there is any necessity for a special notice in Welsh such as is suggested. As regards the legislation which my hon. friend indicates, I am afraid that I cannot hold out any hope.

Canadian Cattle Trade.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he will now inform the House what proposal he has made to extend the time limit for the slaughtering of Canadian cattle at landing ports in this country; and whether it will enable farmers to resume the feeding of young stores.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I have made no such proposal—and no similar proposal which has been made to me had for its object the feeding of young stores. The two subjects are quite distinct.

Bovine Tuberculosis.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been drawn to the Veterinary Surgeon's Report for the year 1901 to the Corporation of Glasgow, showing that, of 46,784 home-bred cattle slaughtered in that year, 6,332, or 13·53, were found affected with tuberculosis, while amongst 49,881 Canadian and States cattle the number was only 66, or ·13; and whether, seeing that in the million and a half of Canadian and States cattle killed in this country since 1892, the rate is about one in 4,000, while it has been ascertained that among the home cattle killed in Glasgow one in every seven or eight is tubercular, and that foreign buyers have demanded tests for tuberculosis in all the breeding animals they have bought in this country, he will propose measures to diminish the prevalence of tuberculosis in our home cattle, and to raise their health to the Canadian standard.

MR. HANBURY: I have seen the Report to which the hon. Member refers. Its author attributes the comparative freedom from bovine tuberculosis of Canadian and United States cattle to the more natural life which they lead in their native country, a condition which it would not be possible, I am afraid, to reproduce in its entirety at home. Some advance has, however, been made in this direction by the enactment of suitable regulations with regard to the ventilation of cowsheds, but the making of such regulations rests with the various local authorities, and their confirmation is in the hands of the Local Government Board, and not of my own Department.

Argentine Cattle Trade.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is continuing his negotiations with the Argentine Minister in this country with the view of opening the slaughtering ports of this country to the importation of live cattle for slaughter from the River Plate, and of opening Argentine ports to the importation of British breeding stock; and, if so, whether he can say when he expects to bring the negotiations to a conclusion, in view of the present prices of meat.

MR. HANBURY: The representatives of the Argentine Government are now, I think, fully aware of my views as to the measures which should be taken in order to afford further security against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into Argentina and importation of diseased animals therefrom. It therefore rests with that Government to take the necessary steps to carry those views into effect if they consider it desirable to do so.

Education Department Architect.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Architect to the Education Department is still permitted to take outside and private professional work, such as advising those responsible for the erection of schools, the plans of which have to be submitted to the judgment of the Board of Education.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): This matter is being carefully considered by the Heads of the Board of Education. In the circumstances, I think the hon. Member will not wish to press his Question at the present time.

Education Bill—Voluntary School Grants.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether in cases where an education grant has been earned by a voluntary school, but not paid before the local education authority becomes responsible for its maintenance, the whole of such grant will in every case be paid over to the foundation managers.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: If I understand the hon. Member's Question correctly, the case is met by Rule (11) of Schedule II. of the Bill.

Schools in the Island of Lewis—Paths Required.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that children residing in the township of Tom-an-Fhuadain, Gravir, in the parish of Lochs, Island of Lewis, are frequently unable to get to school during the winter months on account of there being no footpath; and will the Congested Districts Board consider the expediency of providing a grant in aid for the construction of a path.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): As the hon. Member has already been informed the Congested Districts Board wrote to the Parish Council of Lochs on 18th April, 1901, asking for certain information to enable them to consider an application for this path. The Board have not yet received this information, though they have repeatedly asked for it. Until it comes they are unable to consider the question of a grant in aid of the construction of this path.

Burying Grounds in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Lewis District Committee report that although they have called upon the Parish Council of Uig, Stornoway, under threat of legal proceedings, to take immediate steps to provide burying grounds in place of those at Balanakill, Kirivig, and Little Bernera, Island of Lewis, the request has not been complied with; and will he state the cause of the delay.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The matter is under consideration of the Parish Council, and as negotiations are now proceeding it seems to the Secretary for Scotland inexpedient at present to make further comment which might raise difficulties or prejudice the transactions.

Fishermen's Dwellings at Stornoway.

MR WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the whole of the twenty-nine and a quarter acre sites, for fishermen's dwellings for Stornoway have been applied for; and, if not, will he state how many applications have been received and the number of sites allotted.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Up to 8th November, twenty-six applications were received. Some time is necessary for enquiry and the settlement of details, so no sites have yet been allotted.

Tolsta School, Island of Lewis—Outbreak of Typhus Fever.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, having regard to the fact that the public school at Tolsta, Island of Lewis, which has on its register 196 children, has been closed since 3rd July last on account of an outbreak of fever, and that there is at the present time an epidemic of typhus fever at Tolsta, will he state what steps are being taken to prevent the epidemic from spreading; and, seeing that the local authorities are unable to arrange for the isolation of patients at Tolsta, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of applying to the Treasury for a special grant to meet the difficulty.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Every precaution in the way of segregation, cleanliness and free use of disinfectants has been employed. The typhus cases only numbered six of which four are now convalescent. Under the circumstances the Secretary for Scotland cannot undertake to approach the Treasury.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman make enquiry as to whether there were not four cases of typhus in one house, and no hospital accommodation?

[No answer was returned].

Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate what steps he has taken, or proposes to take, to make public the provisions of the Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act, which recently came into effect, seeing that in some localities no information regarding it is in the possession of the police, and no instructions have been received on the subject.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is not usual for the Crown Office to take any special steps to publish the provisions of an Act of Parliament. I shall, however, be happy to make a communication to the local authorities who are responsible for the police upon the matter.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: To the Sheriffs of the counties, I presume?

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: To the local bodies.

Illegal Trawling off the Caithness Coast.

Mr. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that in the Sheriff Court at Wick, on the 17th October last, a Norwegian seaman described as master of a trawler, was convicted of illegally fishing within the three-mile limit off the coast of Caithness, and that it was elicited in evidence that the real master belonged to Grimsby, and that the owners of the trawler were a Grimsby Company who had the vessel registered in Norway; and, in view of these facts, will he state what steps he proposes to take to prevent a recurrence of such cases, seeing that British trawlers are excluded from trawling within the Moray Firth.

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The information in the possession of the Secretary for Scotland goes to show that the facts of the case are correctly stated in the early part of the hon. Member's Question. Enquiry was made at Brevig through the Norwegian Government, and, according to the information supplied, a decision was come to on the 25th August last by the Maritime Court there, to the effect that the documents and other evidence produced by the Company were satisfactory and entitled the ship to registration as a Norwegian ship. In view of what occurred at Wick on 17th October, the matter has been made the subject of a further communication to the Foreign Office for representation to the Norwegian Government.

Athy Licensing Prosecution.

Mr. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the police prosecution of Mr. Patrick Knowles, publican, at the last petty sessions in Athy, in which it was sworn that the police permitted a drunken man to enter the publican's licensed premises, and then prosecuted the publican; and whether he will direct the police in future to first arrest men seen drunk under such conditions without waiting for an opportunity also to prosecute the publican.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): The police did not permit the drunken man referred to to enter the premises of Mr. Patrick Knowles. On the contrary, he entered into these premises without the knowledge of the police. Even if they did permit this man to enter the publican's premises, as alleged, that is no excuse whatever to the publican for having supplied the drunken man with drink to make him more drunk. No special directions, such as suggested, can be given to the police for the purpose of protecting publicans from the temptation to violate the law. Each case must depend on its own circumstances.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Was it not sworn at the petty sessions that the police did permit the man to enter the premises, for the purpose of getting a prosecution?

Mr. ATKINSON: If so it must have been falsely sworn.

Roads in Queen's County.

Mr. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been directed to the condition of the road leading from Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Queen's County; and whether, in t view of the complaints of the present state of the roads in Ireland, he will be prepared to appoint a special inspector to report as to the manner in which the officials responsible for the roads discharge their duties.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The Board's attention has not been directed to the condition of this road. It is the duty of the County and District Councils, as the case may be, to keep all public works in good condition and repair, and to take all necessary steps for that purpose. In the event of default on the part of either local authority in this respect, the Board, upon receipt of a complaint under Section 82 of the Act of 1898 from the other local authority, would have power to make an order fixing a period for the performance of the duty. If the duty were not performed in the period so fixed the order might be enforced by writ of *mandamus* or the Board might appoint a person to perform the duty. The Department would have no power to take effective action upon the reports of a special inspector.

MR. TULLY: Has not the dilapidation of the roads become very serious in Ireland, and will the Local Government Board appoint an inspector to supervise the officials responsible for them?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have said that the Board would have no power to act on the reports of such an inspector.

Mohill Workhouse Entertainment.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to an all-night entertainment which took place in the board room of Mohill Workhouse on 7th November last; will he state if a licence was granted for a bar that was erected for sale of liquor; and what steps the Government intend taking in the matter.

MR. TULLY: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers, may I ask was not this entertainment got up to provide funds for a technical school in connection with the Union, and did not the Local Government Board sanction the use of the board room?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has anticipated my answer. The Guardians of the Mohill Union applied to the Local Government Board for its consent to the use of the board room of the workhouse for an entertainment to be given with the laudable object of raising funds in aid of a night-school for technical instruction. On the understanding that the officers connected with the workhouse would maintain good order and discipline on the occasion, the Board gave its consent. A similar entertainment was given last year in aid of the Dr. Smyth Memorial fund. Refreshments were sold under the authority of an occasional licence, granted in pursuance of the Inland Revenue Act, 1863.

MR. SLOAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that dancing was carried on in this particular room until 7 a.m.?

MR. WYNDHAM: That was the object of the entertainment.

MR. TULLY: Will the hon. Member allow no fun in Ireland except in Belfast?

Second Term Rent Reductions.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total amount of the reductions in second term rents made by the Land Sub-Commission Courts during the last twelve months.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reductions amounted to £26,047, or 20·4 per cent. on first term rents.

Meath Roads.

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been directed to complaints as to the road from Hill of Down to Ballivor, county Meath, being obstructed by overhanging trees for a distance of two miles; and whether any explanation has been received from the county surveyor of Meath as to his failure to enforce Section 9 of the Act 14 and 15 Vic., c. 92, in this instance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The duty imposed on the county surveyor by the section of the statute referred to has, by the 72nd Section of the Local Government Act, 1898, been vested in the County Council. It is now the duty of the latter body to take the action prescribed by the first-mentioned statute.

Marine Store Dealers Act.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the nature of the instructions sent to the Royal Irish Constabulary to enforce the Marine Store Dealers Act in provincial towns in Ireland; and the number of successful prosecutions by the constabulary under this Act during the last twelve months.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The constabulary are instructed to enforce the provisions of the Acts which apply to marine store dealers and dealers in old metals. The provisions of these Acts have been communicated to the police. A return of prosecutions undertaken during the past year has been called for, and when received will be sent to the hon. Member.

Union Solicitors as County Councillors.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that solicitors to Boards of Guardians are eligible for membership of County Councils, he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board issued a sealed order disqualifying workhouse medical officers for that position; and whether this is in accordance with the practice in England and Scotland.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Solicitors to Boards of Guardians are not Poor Law Officers, and the Local Government Board has no control over them. The order disqualifying paid officers engaged in the administration of the Poor Relief Acts from taking parts in the proceedings of Councils, was issued in the interests of the sick and destitute poor. I have no information as to the practice in England and Scotland.

De Freyne Estate—Cost of Extra Police.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the cost of extra police in connection with the agitation on the De Freyne estate, the amount of the demand for extra police to the Roscommon County Council, and the area on which it will be levied.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The cost of the extra force of police employed in connection with this and neighbouring estates amounts to about £1,200 per annum. For the period from December, 1901, when the force was sent, to the 30th September last, the charge to local rates is £499 4s. 10d., which will be levied off a district comprising 114 townlands and the towns of Ballaghadereen and Loughglynn.

Irish Prison Officials—Chief Warder Hennessy.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds Chief Warder Robert Hennessy was transferred from Maryborough Convict Prison to Mountjoy Local Prison; what was the nature of the complaint against him; and what is the reduction in his salary and the effect on his promotion of this transfer.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This officer was transferred in exchange with another chief warder. There was no complaint against him, and no reduction in his salary. The transfer will have no effect on any prospects he may have of promotion.

Maryborough Gaol—Lynchehaun's Escape.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what changes were made in the prison staff at Maryborough in consequence of the escape of the convict Lynchehaun; how many officers were dismissed the service or reduced in rank; and who has been appointed as Governor of Maryborough Prison, and what are his qualifications.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Acting-Governor has been transferred to his former position of Governor of Kilmainham, a principal warder and a warder were compulsorily retired on pension, one warder was discharged, and two others were reduced in classification. Mr. Weir has been appointed Governor of Maryborough Prison. He has filled the post of Deputy Governor of Mountjoy Convict Prison.

Promotion in the Belfast Post Office.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that since the present Postmaster was appointed to Belfast every vacancy for assistant superintendents (with one exception) has been given to junior clerks; and will he arrange in future that the claims of senior clerks will be considered before an appointment is made.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The claims of all the officers referred to shall be considered for promotion as vacancies occur.

Ballymoney and Portrush Post Offices.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will give particulars of the amount of postal business transacted at Ballymoney and Portrush respectively, and state the reasons which have led to the abandonment of the project of providing a new post-office at Ballymoney, while new premises for postal purposes are being advertised for at Portrush.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Post Office business at Portrush is about 70 per cent. larger than that at Ballymoney. The post office at Ballymoney has recently been enlarged, and a new office is not required there. At Portrush a larger office will be required before long.

Education Bill—Closure Procedure.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of taking steps to abridge the proceedings upon the Education Bill, consequent upon the acceptance of the Closure Resolutions by the House, by limiting (on occasions when closure by compartments is about to operate) the Questions to be put to two, viz., that the Amendments put from the Chair be accepted; and that all Clauses, after Amendment or otherwise, stand part of the Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say no doubt the procedure he suggests would have much to recommend it from the point of view of convenience, but I think the House would probably resent being deprived of the opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the particular questions that come before them. I may say I hope the House will feel that it is not necessary to make any modification in the Rules in this direction; and I do not think it will be necessary if the precedent set at the time of the Home Rule Bill, and the precedent set on the last evening on which there was Closure of this Bill, be followed, as I trust they may be. I remember that, in regard to the Home Rule Bill, the number of divisions that was taken was always considerably less than the actual number of Questions put from the Chair, and it was made more or less a matter of arrangement as to what divisions should be taken, in order that the Opposition—who at that time were the Gentlemen now on this side of the House—might express their objection to particular proposals contained in that measure. I think that is certainly far more convenient than the course that was adopted of dividing against every Motion, whether it was important or unimportant, or whether it embodied a question on which the Opposition agreed with the Government, or whether it dealt with a question on which the Opposition were divided from the Government. I am convinced that the general good sense of the House will be able to solve this question satisfactorily.

MR. MALCOLM: Does the right hon. Gentleman see any chance of the precedent of 1893 being copied in 1902?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope, after what occurred on the day before yesterday, there will be no difficulty.

Aid Grants to Roman Catholic Schools.

*COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the amount to be paid annually as an aid grant to Roman Catholic schools under the Education (England and Wales) Bill from moneys provided by taxation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As my hon. friend is probably aware, the existing aid grant to Roman Catholic schools is abolished, and all the grants are now paid to the local authority. What proportion of these grants paid to the local authority will be used by the local authority in supporting Roman Catholic schools it is impossible for me to foresee.

MR. TULLY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the amount of the equivalent grant for Ireland?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not see how that arises out of the Question.

Amendment of the Registration Laws.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that in Parliamentary elections held towards the end of any year no tenant occupier or lodger is able to vote who has not begun his tenancy at a period of from twenty-six to twenty-nine months previous to the election, the Government will introduce a Bill at an early date to amend the Registration Laws by shortening the period of qualification and establishing a more frequent registration.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As the hon. Gentleman probably anticipates, I cannot give any pledge as to legislation for next year.

ICE CREAM SHOPS (SCOTLAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Managers):—

(2.40.) Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) moved to omit the second paragraph of sub-Section (2). He objected to this provision on the ground that it gave a very vague and unsatisfactory direction to the Board of Education. The words to which he took particular exception were those which provided that the Board of Education should have regard to the principles on which the education given in the school had been conducted in the past. One school might have many pasts. It might first have been an undenominational school. It might have been founded by some individual or individuals without any sectarian intention at all, but from the mere fact that the people living in the district were not interested in educational matters, or were unable to act as managers, the parson might have secured control and gradually imposed upon it a denominational character. He might at first have only introduced religious teaching which was scarcely to be differentiated from undenominational schools, but his successor might have been a man with High Church views, who completed the transformation from an undenominational to a denominational school. It was quite possible for such a case to have occurred, and indeed only on the previous day he was told of a case where an undenominational school was built for the benefit of the children of a community of Welsh miners, which school had since got into the hands of the local parson, and was treated by the Department as a Church of England school. They objected to allowing the Department to make a school such as that a denominational school. It would be much more desirable that there should be a mandatory obligation on the Department to consider what the desires of the founder were. There was no reason why the Board should be absolutely bound by the views of the original founder, as the circumstances might have changed, but it was a serious thing that a mandatory clause of this kind should suggest that the Board should take into consideration what might have become customary in the district. He hoped the Government would consent to the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 16, to leave out the words, 'In making an order under this section with regard to any school, the Board of Education shall have regard to the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'In making an order under this section with regard to any school, the Board of Education shall have regard to' stand part of the Clause, as amended."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the object of the words in question was that in those cases where there were no trust deeds the Board of Education should act so as to take into account as far as possible the actual practice adopted in the school that was to be dealt with. That was the only equitable way to deal with the matter. Of course if there was a dispute, that could be put right in the Law Courts, but *de facto*, the only way to deal with the matter was the one the Clause suggested.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) thought the right hon. Gentleman had missed the point of his hon. friend's Amendment. His hon. friend's case was that there were a number of schools with regard to which no trust deeds or other documents existed; where there was no definition under the authority of the founder or in any scheme as to what kind of religious instruction should be givenin the school; yet, in point of fact, a practice had grown up, not based on any recommendation, under which distinctive denominational instruction had been given. His hon. friend conceived that that practice was an improper practice and an unjustifiable one, which, though it might have been acquiesced in, was not legal. He desired to prevent that practice being followed in the future. He based his argument on the ancient principle that a practice which had no legal basis could not vary the law, or, in other words, abuse did not make right. Where there were cases where abuse had occurred, they ought to go back to what the original intention of the founder was, and if the intention was that no distinctive denominational teaching should be given, that intention should be observed. If they could not prove what the intention of the founder was, the fair course would seem to be to make the school available for the largest number of the population, and give the least ground for friction on the part of any sect. In either case it would be improper that ancient usage, illegitimate in its action, should be suffered to prevail. In the absence of proof the school should be available for the largest number, and managed in conformity with the general wish. Therefore he thought his hon. friend was justified in his Amendment, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept it. If it were not accepted friction would arise, and a good many complaints would be made which would find their way both to this House and the Law Courts.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said he would point out the difficulty in which the Education Department would be placed if the Clause was allowed to stand. It was not proposed to interfere in the case of managers giving religious teaching in harmony with the denominational character of the school. The difficulty was to determine the principle upon which the education of the school had been conducted in the past. He was acquainted with a chapel of ease built by a number of Churchmen with the intention and design of propagating Low Church doctrines, the patronage of the living being vested in the vicar of the parish, which position came later into the hands of an occupant through purchase. A school was subsequently built for the same purpose, but the chapel and the school in time passed into the hands of a High Churchman, with the result that the whole tone of doctrine preached and character of the school entirely changed. He wished to know whether under this Clause the school was to be considered and conducted on the former Low Church principles, according to the wishes of the founders or the more recent High Church teaching? Which would the Department adopt as being "the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past." He thought the Government would be wise to accept the Amendment, omitting this Section, and so give greater freedom in making the Order.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said that nobody doubted that the interests of the Church were adequately protected, and he thought that in such a case as that put before the Committee, where, through laxity, or indifference, or neglect, a school founded for a particular purpose passed into the hands of others, the particular purpose for which the school was founded should have some protection. He thought that the Government in settling the terms which the Board of Education were to draw up, should say what they ought to have regard to, and that they ought to have regard to the wishes of the founders of the schools. Hon. Members were always talking of the "pious founder" and robbery and spoliation, and he thought if any interests were to be looked after the interests of those who built the schools should be regarded.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) thought that in his speech the First Lord had assumed that the schools had always been carried on according to the wishes of the founder. There was no desire on the part of the Opposition to alter the system where the schools were so conducted. The First Lord had not, in fact, dealt with the point of this Amendment, which was that, where the wishes of the founder, for good reason or for bad, had not been carried out, the schools should be made to revert to their original purpose. He objected to the Clause because it left the matter quite vague. He desired to ask the Secretary to the Education Department what the Government meant by "the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past." If that meant that it had been conducted in accordance with the wishes of the founders, there was nothing to be said, but take the case of a school such as had been described, where, during the last two years, the character of the school had been altered from what it had been for twenty years previously; did "conducted in the past" relate to the two years or the previous twenty? All that was desired by the Amendment was that the founder's wishes should be protected in a school the conditions of which had changed, and which was not carried on in accordance with the wishes of its founder.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) characterised the reply of the First Lord of the Treasury as the most unsatisfactory that had ever been given during the whole course of the Bill. The only thing the right hon. Gentleman had said was that the law courts were open for the settlement of disputes. He had refused the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, that the locality should have a *locus standi* before the Board of Education when an Order was made. An Order had the effect of a trust deed, and therefore the remedy offered was no remedy at all. It seemed to him that this was another effort on the part of the Church to obtain property which she had no right to. He held in his hand the particulars of an investigation made in the Holmfirth Parliamentary Division of Yorkshire, which was a strong inducement for the acceptance of the Amendment. The first illustration he would make was a school called the New Mills Infant School. That school was rebuilt in 1875 by public subscription, and in 1877 it was put under a scheme which distinctly stated it was to be used as an undenominational school. At the present time the management consisted of the vicar and three Churchmen, who held their position by virtue of a subscription of five shillings. They were the men who would apply to the Board of Education before the Order was issued. There was a distinct invitation to those persons to put forward a scheme which would convert undenominational schools into denominational schools. That was a case where the reply of the First Lord had no effect at all, because there was no remedy at law if there were no trustees at present existent. He had found, in the course of his investigations, that there were, in one Parliamentary Division, no fewer than seven cases in which schools founded for undenominational purposes had been actually acquired by the Church of England, and which at the present moment were put down in a Parliamentary Return as national schools, although they were built and endowed with money provided by people who had no idea that they would have that character in regard to religious instruction. There was reason in this Amendment, but if the Government could not see the way to accept it, something in the nature he proposed in an Amendment lower down on the Paper might be accepted—"That the Board of Education should have regard to the principles and purposes for which the school was founded." He made this plea in fairness of mind, and hoped the Government would meet them half way.

(3.4) MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said there was a point arising out of this Amendment on which he considered the Committee would do well to get the advice of the Attorney General. He had listened very carefully to what the First Lord had said in answer to his hon. friend's proposal, that if there was anything illegal, or wrong, or contrary to the rights of ownership, that could be settled in the courts of law. Now, what he wanted the Attorney General to advise them upon was this; if this Clause passed with these words in it, would not the recourse to the courts of law be entirely precluded? The Clause gave power to the Board of Education to make an Order which should recognise the principles on which the education in the school had been conducted in the past. Would not the mere fact of the Clause being in its present form go to legalise the very principles on which the education given in the schools had been conducted? The result would be to make the Order effective as if it were part of the trust deed. Therefore, if the Board of Education, having regard to the principles in question, passed an Order which gave effect to those principles, would not that Order be as valid as the trust deed, and would not, therefore, the hypothetically illegal principles be legalised by the Order?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman had rather exaggerated what would be the effect of the Order made by the Board of Education under this Section. This Order would deal merely with the question of the appointment of managers; it would not affect the terms of any trust deed which the court of law might declare to be binding upon the foundation. And the result of that would be that the court of law would find that the principles of a particular denomination ought to be taught in the schools. No doubt what the hon. and learned Gentleman had said was true to this extent, that the Order fixed who were to be the managers, but the Order would not in any way affect how the managers were to be elected, or determine the religious character of the schools. That would be open to the court of law to determine in the case suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. WHITLEY hoped the hon. and learned Attorney General would pardon him, but did he say that the managers under this Bill would have the power to determine the nature of the religious instruction to be given in these schools?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he was not going to be diverted into a general argument on a very fascinating subject, but to deal with the very pertinent question put by the hon. and learned Member for Dundee. In regard to the general effect of those words, of course, they were not intended to have any application so as to over-ride any trust or legal rights in regard to the school, but they were only intended to afford guidance, where the matter might otherwise be in doubt, as to what were the principles with which they were to have regard in determining how the managers were to be selected. The right hon. Member for South Aberdeen would recognise the familiar principle that where there was no trust to be clearly deduced from the history of the institution or documents connected with it they must have regard to long usage. That subject was very fully dealt with in a remarkable speech made in this House by Lord Macaulay in regard to a certain body in this country. The right hon. Gentleman might identify the speech he referred to by a very curious error of the reporter; Lord Macaulay was made to speak of the "Pandects of Benares" instead of the "Pundits of Benares."† All that this Clause was intended to do was to call attention to the fact that long usage, in the absence of any clear right otherwise expressed, was a matter to which attention should be paid in determining how the managers were to be appointed.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he wished to call attention to the case of a small school in Wales. Fifty or sixty years ago certain Nonconformist miners by their weekly contributions out of their wages erected a school, but the time came when they could not maintain the school owing to economic causes. Since 1870 the school had been carried on with the help of subscriptions from Church people, and the management of the school was now in the hands of three Church managers. Now, he put it, that as the capital charge of that building, which was originally intended by these Nonconformist colliers to be a Nonconformist, or at least a secular, school, had been found by these miners, was it reasonable that the school building should be handed over as a Church school because, since 1870, the principles on which the teaching had been given in it were what was called Church principles? As long as the school had been kept up by Church subscribers it might have been reasonable that the management should be in the hands of Church managers, but after this Bill was passed this building would no longer be a Church school; and local feeling would be strongly aroused if a grave injustice were done, if their intention were absolutely disregarded, and the school handed over as a Church school while it was to be maintained out of the rates largely paid by these very miners. He submitted to the First Lord that if he would not accept the Amendment of his hon. friend he might consider the words suggested by the hon. Member for Halifax. The claim of the Church to the exclusive use of the voluntary schools was based on the rights of property, and here was a case where the property was not the Church's — although the Church had had the full advantage of its use for many years—and he thought it would be only fair that the school should be handed back to the people by whom it was built and for whom it was intended.

---

† The reference is to a speech by Macaulay (in the Commons) on the Second Reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, 6th June, 1844, reported, in (3) *Debates*, LXXV., 338. In the preface to his "Speeches" (corrected by himself)—(1865 Edition)—Macaulay points out many extraordinary blunders in the report, including that referred to by Sir Robert Finlay.—[ED.]

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) said that there were a large number of cases, beside those mentioned by the hon. Member for Halifax, where schools were built by public subscriptions from all classes and upon allotment lands. These schools had one by one been absorbed and made denominational schools. There was a case in which a school was endowed for teaching girls sewing and reading; now it was being used to teach boys the Catechism.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said that the Committee had had a very partial reply from the Attorney General. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that, under the scheme for the appointment of managers, the managers would be all of one denomination. Afterwards an action might be taken in a Court of law; and it might be found that the principles taught in the school ought to be for another religious denomination. In that case, they would have a situation which the Prime Minister had repeatedly declared would be impossible, viz., managers of one denomination dictating the religious teaching of another denomination. There was another point in which he, as a Churchman, was interested, and which arose out of another matter, the root of which lay in the present unfortunate differences in the Church of England. There were three types of Churchmen. He had heard them described, perhaps by the enemy, as "the low and lazy," "the broad and hazy," and "the high and crazy." The question he wished to ask was—Would it, under the Clause, be necessary for the Board of Education to appoint a Low Churchman as a successor to a Low Churchman, a High Churchman to succeed a High Churchman, and so on; or would the Board simply have regard to the denomination. He ventured to suggest that the language of the Clause should be altogether altered. The intention of the Clause was perfectly obvious. It was, that a school of one denomination should not be diverted to another denomination. Would it not be far simpler to provide for the carrying out of that intention?

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said he would very strongly object to the Education Department having the right to say that, if the management of a school happened to be in the hands of the Church, that school should be dubbed, once and for all, a Church school. He desired to ask two questions, in reference to two words in the sub-Section which were very vague. Were they to understand the word "principles" to refer merely to the religious instruction given in the school, and not to comprise the principles on which the school had been conducted? There were many cases in which the founder gave the site for a school, and built it, with or without assistance, and where he allowed the Board of Management to be elected by the inhabitants of the district generally. Would the word "principles," in such a case, comprise not merely educational principles in regard to religious instruction, but the principles of management also. He submitted that some such meaning as that should be included; otherwise, they would be excluding the principles on which the school was managed in the past. His other question referred to the word "past." He assumed the word was intended to cover the past of the school, so far as it could be reached. He did not see how the Board of Education could say that they would only consider a period of three or five years. The words were vague, and the Committee was entitled to some further explanation regarding them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he would like to put a converse case to the Prime Minister. A school was transferred to a School Board; the managers and the trustees were still in existence, and had only parted with the school temporarily. He wished to know whether the sub-Section would apply in such a case. Would the Board of Education have regard to the principles on which the school was conducted in the past, and decline to allow that school to revert to its position as a denominational school. The Prime Minister promised to insert words which would protect parishes in such cases from the possibility of a re-transference; because since the school had been given up, the School Board had kept the building in repair, and made it an effective school; and it would be rather a hardship if it were to be re-transferred, and new bitterness created in the parish. It was infinitely worse that things should be turned back, as it were, than that the conditions of things when the Act came into operation should be continued. The Prime Minister promised to consider words to meet a case such as that; and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would redeem his pledge, if he remembered his speech.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he recollected the speech to which the hon. Gentleman had referred. He had explained to the Committee, on more than one occasion, how he thought the rather difficult situation which the hon. Gentleman brought to the notice of the Committee should be dealt with. He did not think they ought to interfere in any way with the ownership of such schools. They, at present, belonged by hypothesis to some denomination; they had been temporarily transferred or leased to a School Board; but the lease did not interfere, was not intended to interfere, and ought not to be allowed to interfere with the freehold or ownership of the schools in any way; and, in so far as the rights of ownership came into the question at all, those rights ought to be absolutely protected. Then the hon. Gentleman asked, "Are you going to allow a school to be re-transferred by the local authority, and turned into a denominational school under the new conditions created by this Bill?" The answer was that the mere re-transfer by the local authority of a school to the owners of that school ought not to carry in that the re-establishment of that school as a denominational school. That ought not to happen *ipso facto*; the case ought to be considered under the special provisions in Clauses 9 and 10, which ought to be held operative; and the deciding authority would not permit the re-establishment of the school as a denominational school without a local inquiry.

MR. WHITLEY said he gathered that the First Lord of the Treasury was half inclined to accept the suggestion he had made, which he thought would save a good deal of time. It was to add words which would make the sub-Section read, "The Board of Education shall have regard to the principles on which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past, and the purpose for which the school was founded." He would respectfully ask the First Lord of the Treasury to reply before they proceeded to a division.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, as he understood the situation, his view of the equity of the case was that where there was a trust deed, that trust deed must govern, and must not be overlooked. But they had to deal with the admittedly difficult cases in which there were no trust deeds; and all he could say was that, in considering those cases, the Board of Education, in framing their schemes, must have regard for use and wont. That did not interfere with the ownership. Supposing it was shown in the various cases brought before the Committee by hon. Gentlemen opposite that a Church school had gradually slid, as it were, by imperceptible degrees, into the control of another Church, the remedy would be in a court of law, and that remedy would not be overridden by the Clause. If it could be shown that a school did not belong to the denomination using it, that denomination ought to be deprived of the further use of the school; but the machinery to determine that was a court of law. It would be impossible, and most undesirable, for him to endeavour to give a judgment on the particular cases brought before the Committee, and to say whether in this case or in that, on the facts presented, he thought the school really belonged to the denomination using it. That was a question it was impossible for him to determine. It could only be properly determined in a court of law; and the Clause did not stop the remedy of a court of law. He really did not see that anything more could be done, or should be done. The whole case was governed by the general principles he had laid down, which were in accordance with the practice of the House, and which carried out the general rules of equity which generally prevailed in their debates.

MR. BRYCE said the remedy afforded by the courts of law was an expensive one, which people might not be willing to take advantage of. The Board of Education had on many occasions practically made a school a denominational school by giving it denominational managers. Take the case of a school which was formed without any denominational intention, which had fallen into the hands of the Wesleyan body, and which had been carried on as a Wesleyan school for fifteen years. The Board of Education made that a denominational school by appointing Wesleyan managers, but nobody would feel inclined to test the matter in a court of law. His objection to the sub-Section was that it seemed to him to compel the Board of Education to recognise what might have been a wrong use of the school, and the school might become a Wesleyan school by usage which was entirely illegal. There was a considerable danger in the use that might be made of the sub-Section, and he thought the Government would be wise either to drop it altogether or to modify it.

MR. WHITLEY argued that when persons came to the Board of Education with proposals for a scheme, the Education Department should have power to require the managers to produce evidence of what the principles were on which the school was founded. In the case of the New Mills school, to which he had referred previously, they would produce the scheme. All that the Amendment asked was that they should not take the school as it was then carried on, as it might be carried on in a manner contrary to the intentions of the founder, but should require evidence of the intention with which the school was founded.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the case which the hon. Gentleman had instanced would not present any difficulty. The school was held under a scheme; the scheme was a trust. The school therefore was practically carried on under a trust, and that trust would be the governing consideration. Everything done under the Clause must be done in conformity with the trust, if there was one, because the whole Clause was framed with the idea that the trust should govern the scheme.

(3.34.) Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 561.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour. Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Campbell, RtHn. J. A. (Glasgow

Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St.Albans)
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robinson Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot,Rt.Hn.T.G.(Oxf.Univ)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.HnSirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan,Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce. Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt.Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Philipps, John Wynford
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel,HerbertL. (Cleveland)

Sandys,Lieut.-Col.Thos.Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid)
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Whitley.

(3.48.) MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) thought it very desirable that in considering the form of their order the Board of Education should have regard to the ownership of the school building, and he moved accordingly.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 17, after 'regard,' insert 'to the ownership of the school building, and.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the Amendment appeared to be a proper addition to the Clause, and therefore, on behalf of the Government, he would accept it.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON moved to add the proviso "That no such Order should treat as denominational a school which cannot be shown to have received a denominational character from those who established it." He pointed out that the Government had admitted the possibility of abuses in this matter, and had expressed the opinion that such abuses ought not to be allowed. He thought, therefore, they might fairly give consideration to this Amendment. Instances had been given in which the original intention of the founders had been entirely departed from and a wrongful usage of the school grown up. These schemes were to be practically statutory, and it was not right that a school founded as undenominational should by Act of Parliament be turned into a denominational school.

Amendment proposed—

"After line 18, to insert, 'Provided that no such Order shall treat as denominational a school which cannot be shown to have received a denominational character from those who established it.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought the words went a great deal too far. By long usage a school might have been enjoyed by a particular denomination, and on the strength of that usage a scheme sanctioned by which the school was devoted to a particular purpose connected with some form of religion. The effect of this Amendment would be to rip up all that arrangement, and send the Board of Education back, perhaps 300 or 400 years, to inquire what the intention of the founders was.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said the remarks of the Attorney General reminded him of a case in which it was very desirable that the foundation should be, to use the hon. and learned Member's phrase, "ripped up." The case to which he referred was that of the endowment of an educational charity by a Nonconformist more than 200 years ago. In course of time that charity had become impressed with a Church character, and was at present administered by five clergymen of the Church of England. The object of the trust had been entirely altered, and the charity was now of a purely Episcopal character. In cases of that kind it was very necessary that the schemes should be reviewed, and, having regard to the new provision made for education by this Bill, the present was a proper and convenient opportunity for laying down a rule of this kind.

MR. BRYCE expressed his surprise at the line the Attorney General had taken. The hon. and learned Member had argued as though there was a statute of limitations in this matter. Could any statute or dictum be pointed to which declared there was such a prescription?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the Amendment would apply to every case; it would go behind every scheme, and send the Board back to the original intention of the founders.

Mr. BRYCE said the Attorney General had argued on usage, and said nothing about schemes.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he distinctly stated that there might be a case of considerable usage, a scheme founded on that usage, and that the result of the Amendment would be to set all that aside.

Mr. BRYCE was sorry if he misunderstood the hon. and learned Member, but he understood his argument to go the length of saying that where there was usage, and not a scheme, usage was to prevail. If, however, the Amendment was varied so as not to cover schemes, would the Attorney General accept it? Would he agree that, where it was a matter merely of usage, that usage should not be taken to have turned a school originally unsectarian into a sectarian establishment? The cases concerned were comparatively modern; they did not go back into the mists of ages, as had been suggested.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman was proposing to enter into a controversy which had already been before Parliament, and which, in one conspicuous instance, had been decided in a sense contrary to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman. In the celebrated controversy about the right of the Unitarian dissenters to their chapels, there was no doubt that the body had changed their theological position, and there was nothing but usage to justify them in retaining their chapels and schools; yet it was held to be improper to break through the usage of many years standing. Parliament not merely did not interfere to take the chapels away from the Unitarian dissenters, but they interfered to secure the chapels to them; they broke through the ordinary law in order to do what they thought was equitable and fair.

Mr. BRYCE said the case referred to raised an entirely different principle. That was, the question of the continuity of a visible church of a particular religious body, but the present question raised a totally different issue.

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) pointed out that under the Endowed Schools Acts, and under the Parish Councils Act of 1894, when dealing with charities, a limitation of this character was inserted. The proposal was therefore not new.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said the question was whether or not they were going to put these schools into the category of denominational schools. Surely it was not unreasonable, where it could be done, and where the schools were never intended to be denominational, that they should be stereotyped as denominational schools. When these schools had been built within the last hundred years there was no difficulty in getting at their origin. The Attorney General had not attempted to meet the argument that where a school was not denominational when founded it should be continued for ever to be so used. He suggested the addition of the following words: "All of which have been made denominational by a valid scheme." He thought that would meet the point of the Attorney General.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he was willing to accept the addition of the words suggested, and he would move his Amendment in the amended form.

Amendment amended—

"By inserting, at the end the words 'or which has not been made denominational by a valid scheme.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that he could not accept this Amendment. As he had pointed out before, there were two points which this Amendment entirely ignored as originally proposed, namely length of possession, and the circumstance that they might even, in some cases, have schemes in accordance with usage. The Amendment to the Amendment would remove the second of these objections, but it did not deal with the first at all. It was common ground that where there was a valid existing trust it must remain, and no one questioned that. But the hon. Member had now actually proposed an Amendment which said that, however long possession had been enjoyed, the burden of showing that it was founded for denominational purposes would be thrown upon them. This Amendment was intended to throw upon those who had been in the enjoyment of the school for any length of time the burden of showing that it was established, in the first instance, for that purpose, and if they could establish that, then enjoyment for 200 years was not to count for anything at all. That was contrary to the principle upon which this House usually proceeded, and it was entirely contrary to the principle upon which the House acted in the case of the schools and chapels belonging to the Unitarians.

MR. WHITLEY said he hoped his hon. friend would go to a division with his Amendment, and thus enable them to vote in favour of a principle which he was sure was perfectly just. The Attorney General had referred to the argument that because these buildings were erected some time ago they should not now be taken into account. That was one kind of justice for Nonconformists and another for Churchmen. How many Church schools were there to-day which were built by Churchmen, but which had never had a single penny from subscriptions spent upon them, all the expenses having come out of the public funds? Hundreds of those schools had been maintained out of the rates and by means of grants from the Education Department. Therefore, if equal justice were done all the way round, these schools, which were built avowedly for undenominational purposes, would not be continued as denominational schools as was now proposed.

(4.10.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 86; Noes, 200. (Division List No. 562.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir Wm. Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Campbell, RtHn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHonJA (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, SirT. R. (TowerHamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gore, HnG. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirE. W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. WilliamEdw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth)
Macartney, RtHn. W. GEllison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, RtHnSirH. E (Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. SirFrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, AbelH. (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC (Northm'b. Tyneside
Smith, JamesParker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. SirC. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

The next Amendment on the Paper stood in the name of Mr. Edmund Robertson, and was as follows—

"In line 24, after 'shall,' insert 'subject to the provisions of this Act, have the exclusive right of appointing and dismissing the teachers.'"

*(4.25.) THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think this Amendment is relevant to this Clause. This Clause does not define the powers of the managers. It only refers to their qualifications.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked the attention of the Committee to sub-Section (4) of the new Clause, which was in the following terms:—

> "Notwithstanding anything in any trust deed, the body of managers appointed under this Act for a public elementary school not provided by the local education authority shall be the managers of that school both for the purposes of the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, and this Act, and, so far as respects the management of the school as a public elementary school, for the purpose of the trust deed.'

That was the only Clause which conferred power on this special body of managers, and he proposed to enlarge the powers.

* THE CHAIRMAN: I think that to insert the word "exclusive" would be really to make confusion where there is no confusion. I am perfectly clear that the local authority has the right, to dismiss and if you now proceed to put in "the exclusive right" you are very likely to lead to confusion.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was willing to move the Amendment without the word "exclusive."

* THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is very doubtful whether the Amendment should come under this Clause at all, but if the hon. Member thinks it does, I shall not object to his moving it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he had some reason to hope that the Amendment would be accepted by the Government. It carried out the policy which the Government had repeatedly and distinctly declared was their policy.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): I rise to order. I do not know whether the hon. Member is going to move the Amendment. It is out of order because it is contrary to what the Committee has already decided, namely, that the appointment of teachers should be subject to the veto of the local authority. If he is going to move it without the word "exclusive" it is tautology, because the Committee has already decided that the managers are to appoint the teachers.

* The CHAIRMAN: I think it is quite clear that the word "exclusive" should not be in, because it cannot but lead to confusion.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON stated that he would move the Amendment in the form suggested by the Chairman. On 28th October his hon. friend the Member for the Morley Division moved in effect the same provision as an Amendment on Clause 8. His right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire pointed out then that nowhere in the Bill was this power given to the managers. The First Lord of the Treasury, in his reply, said—

> "There had never been any doubt or secrecy on the part of the Government as to what their policy was on this matter. The appointment of the teachers would be with the managers, and with the managers as a whole, acting in their corporate capacity, and, therefore, there could be no difference of opinion between the Government and the mover of the Amendment on that point."

Then his hon. friend the Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs pointed out that there were to his knowledge trust deeds in which the appointment of the teachers was given, not to the managers under the deeds, but to the incumbent or the proprietors of the school. To that the First Lord answered—

> "If there are trust deeds such as the h n. Member speaks of—and it is possible that there mav be—then I think there is a case for inserting words to make the point clear."

The hon. Member for the Morley Division said that after the assurance of the Leader of the House that this point would be made perfectly clear, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment. On the same day a question came up as regards dismissal in reference to an Amendment which he himself had put down at that stage of the Bill. That Amendment was ruled out of order, and the First Lord repeated the assurance already quoted. He said—

> "My view, which I have over and over again stated, is that, in so far as functions are left to the managers of a school, they are left to be exercised by the managers as a body."

It was intimated by the Chairman that the First Lord would propose a new Clause later on, and on what he took to be an assurance that the power of dismissal as well as of appointment would come up in the Clause now under discussion, he abstained from moving the Amendment of which he had given notice. He submitted that both as to the appointment and dismissal of teachers, the Government were committed by their declarations at previous stages of the Bill to accept the Amendment he now proposed. He would not dwell on the head of appointment, but in regard to the dismissal of teachers, he would like to bring before the Committee the necessity for such an Amendment. They had been going on this question blind: they had been dealing for days and weeks with legal instruments which they had not seen. This very Clause tore up, at all events affected, tens of thousands of trust deeds, only one or two of which were identified in the small Blue-book laid on the Table a few days ago. But in one there were provisions relating to the dismissal of teachers which he was quite certain were not known to the majority of hon. Members. In the National Society's trust deed, a Committee of management was appointed, and to that Committee was committed the power of selection and dismissal of the schoolmaster, and schoolmistress and their assistants, except when under the provisions afterwards mentioned the dismissal of any master, mistress, or assistant should be awarded by the Bishop of the diocese or the arbitrators. Two bodies external to the local authority and the Board of Managers had the power of dismissal. When a dispute arose between the minister, not necessarily in his capacity of a member of the committee, and the committee of management respecting the religious instruction of the scholars, or the dismissal of any teacher from the school, on account of his or her defective or unsound instruction of the children in religion, the matter was to be laid before the bishop, and the decision of the bishop in writing, after it had been laid before the committee, should be final and exclusive in the matter. That dealt with the bishop. But that was not all. Supposing the matter in dispute other than, and except such difference as last described should arise in the committee of management, the minority might apply to the Lord President of the Privy Council for the time being, and to the bishop of the diocese wherein the school was situated, who might appoint arbitrators to make inquiry into the matter of difference and decide in the dispute. But the deed went beyond that. It was further declared—

> "That if the said bishop, or the said arbitrators upon any such reference shall direct or award that any master, mistress, or teacher shall be dismissed, such direction or award, when a copy thereof shall have been served upon the said master, mistress, or teacher personally, or by the same being left at his or her place of abode, or at the school, addressed to the said master, mistress, or teacher, as the case may require, shall operate as a dismissal of the said master, mistress, or teacher, so as to prevent him or her thenceforth from having any interest in her or his office, or in the said school or premises under, or by virtue of, this deed, and so as to disqualify him or her from holding thenceforth any right or interest under this deed by virtue of his or her previous or any future appointment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: From what is the hon. and learned Gentleman reading ?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was reading from page 5 of the Blue-book on precedents of trust deeds. There might be a question of ambiguity, as to whether this particular power of dismissal given to the bishop could only be exercised as a consequence of the arbitration having taken place upon the difference which had arisen. That might be argued; but he did not so read the trust deed. He read it that this power was given to the bishop in addition to the general powers given to the arbitrators. The bishop himself apparently independent of the arbitrators might direct the dismissal of the master, mistress, or teacher. Whether or no, there was given to the bishop under two heads the power of dismissal. Now he did not think that that was in the contemplation of the House, when, as he understood, the Government came to an agreement that the power of dismissal should be vested in the managers subject only to the veto of the local authority. It was not desirable that such a system should be perpetuated, and it was to obviate that that he had proposed his Amendment. The whole policy of the Bill in regard to non-provided schools was that there should be dual control—the provided schools were under single control—the control of the managers on the one hand, and the control of the education authority on the other. But up to this point they had not recognised or admitted the possibility of a third and extraneous body interfering with the appointment or dismissal of the teachers. He believed that in some of the trust deeds contained in the Blue-book the powers were stronger than those he had quoted; but this was the important deed—the deed of the National Society which demanded the attention of the Committee. He appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury to abide by the declarations he had made so often, that, so far as the management of the school, including the appointment and dismissal of teachers was concerned, the State should only recognise these two authorities—the local education authority, and the body of managers, created by the Bill. He appealed to the Committee whether it was to be tolerated for a moment that the teachers of the State, supported by public funds, should be dismissed by an extraneous authority? The power of dismissal was given to the bishops in two separate cases; first, when a dispute arose between the clergy and the laity. In that event the decision of the bishop was final. Or, when a dispute arose in the committee, and any member of the committee in the minority might appeal to the bishop and the Lord President, who would appoint arbitrators, and these arbitrators, or the bishop, might award and declare the dismissal of the master, mistress, or teacher.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 24, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words, 'subject to the provisions of this Act, have the right of appointing and dismissing the teachers.'"—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that he observed the Government were not quite ready to make answer to the argument of his hon. friend the Member for Dundee. He was not astonished at that, because the Attorney General and the Prime Minister, who affected to ignore the law, to spurn and scorn the law, including the law of the lawyers, had not had an opportunity of discussing the trust deed. He could put the case for this Amendment in a very few words. The provision was that there were two classes of appeal. The first dealt with the case where the dismissal of a teacher from the school was on the ground of his or her defective or unsound instruction in religion, or, where the dispute arose between the minister and the managers, and in that case the appeal was to be to the bishop. In all other cases the dispute might be referred to a Board of Arbitrators selected by certain persons, the arbitrators including an inspector of schools. The Clause in the deed to which his hon. and learned friend referred was the Clause setting forth what would be the result in the two cases, and the construction placed before the Committee by his hon. and learned friend was the true one. There was no doubt that it was clearly understood that there was to be no appeal under this Bill to the bishop or to any extraneous authority. In the case of a non-provided school the managers ought to determine whether a teacher should be dismissed. The clause recognised an appeal from the decision of the managers to the bishop and to arbitrators, and in his opinion there ought to be nothing of the sort. The matter ought to be determined by the local authority, or the managers of the schools, as the case might be.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the case which the right hon. Member had brought before the Committee was one that had not been previously considered, and, so far as he personally was concerned, it was a point which was entirely new. He had not thought of the appeal to the bishop in the case of a dismissal on the ground of incompetence or neglect on the part of a teacher to teach religion in accordance with the denominational rule of the school. He dismissed altogether the point raised with regard to arbitrators as irrelevant, inasmuch as they had made general provisions handing over the control of secular instruction to the local authority. With regard to the position the bishop occupied in connection with religious instruction, he confessed that aspect of the case was new to him. The hon. and learned Gentleman had quoted a previous debate in which he had said, not for the first time, that his conception of the Bill had always been that the managers, though a composite body, should act as a single body, and through a majority of its members. He thought that should apply to all the subjects that came under the control of the managers. That, of course, excluded the dismissal of the teacher by any individual member of the board of managers, whether a clergyman or any other member; but on the face of it, it did not exclude an appeal to the bishop. He must not be taken as giving any decision on the part of the Government as to the policy they ought to pursue in the matter, but when that decision was given it would comply with the general policy they had laid down. He could not say more to the hon. and learned Gentleman at present, except that he did not think this was the proper place in the Bill to raise this question.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Where does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that it ought to be raised?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. and learned Attorney General suggested that the schedule was the proper place.

MR. BRYCE said the Government ought to be grateful to his hon. and learned friend for having brought this matter to their notice. He pointed out that if the matter was left to be dealt with in the schedule, there would be no opportunity to discuss it; and suggested to the right hon. Gentleman whether, under the circumstances, an opportunity could not be found for discussing it when Clause 8 was discussed on Report.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would consider whether anything could be done at a later stage.

MR. BRYCE said the matter was obviously one not only to be discussed, but also to be dealt with. It could not be passed over without some decision being arrived at. The right hon. Gentleman had indicated the decision which might be arrived at, and that decision might be considered a right one by the Opposition, but the matter ought not to be left as it was. His view was that after the managers and the local authority no third party ought to be allowed to come in.

MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said it was wrong to regard this intervention of the bishop as a dismissal by the bishop. It was an erroneous view that the bishop would have any power to dismiss a teacher. He quoted from a form of trust deed for Church schools issued by the Education Department 1845–1870 to show that a case was stated for the bishop on a matter of doctrine on which he gave his ruling, and that while the decision of the bishop would be "final and conclusive in the matter," the committee of management was "expressly required to take all such measures as may be necessary for immediately carrying the said decision into complete effect." So that the matter was put back into the hands of the managers. The bishop might have found in favour of the teacher. It would therefore, he thought, be a great pity if the idea got abroad that the bishop had power to dismiss a teacher. If this power was altered by hon. Members opposite, they would deprive managers of a very great advantage which they now possessed. The power was a valuable privilege given to the managers, and not an arbitrary power given to the bishop.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he did not propose to go into the question of the arbitration at all. No doubt many of the trust deeds did provide an absolute power of dismissal either on secular or religious grounds, and they were therefore in conflict with Clause 8. It might not be necessary to do anything, but he submitted that rather than allow a conflict of the sort to arise, with the possibility of litigation, it was necessary to make it quite clear that whatever the terms of the trust deed were, the terms of Clause 8 should be absolute. Would Clause 8, as far as it set up a veto on the dismissal of a teacher, be quite absolute?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, on secular grounds.

DR. MACNAMARA asked whether it was not necessary to do something to remove any appearance of conflict between this Clause and Clause 8.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(5.0.) LORD HUGH CECIL begged leave to suggest a remedy which he thought would be acceptable to the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and which would reserve the whole question of what were to be the precise relations of the board of management to a dismissal in regard to religious instruction, while it would absolutely concede the point made by the hon. Member for North Camberwell.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment proposed—

"After the words 'provisions of this Act,' to insert 'and to the provisions of the trust deed relating to religious education.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the noble Lord's Amendment would not do at all. It was not acceptable to the front Opposition Bench, nor would it be, he thought, to the front Government Bench, for it would perpetuate the position that was now possible under the trust deed. There were two questions of policy which he should like to put to the Prime Minister. The first was this. He assumed that the Government were not willing that the clergyman, in spite of the other members of the committee of management, if he could get his bishop to agree with him on appeal, was to have the right of dismissal. He understood that the Government intended that only the committee of management acting as a homogeneous body, could dismiss, and not a particular member of the committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No particular member.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: The dismissal must be by the committee of management, or the majority of the committee, quite apart from any question of appeal?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that was a clear statement, and therefore they must take away entirely from the clergyman the right which he would have under this deed of saying there ought to be a dismissal and then carrying it on appeal to the bishop. The other question of policy was this. It was suggested that there must be an appeal to the bishop from the decision of this body. Surely they were right in assuming that that was not the view of the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not quite follow the reasoning of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He rightly represented the views of the Government when he said that they contemplated the managers acting as a homogeneous body, but he did not see, without more consideration than he had been able at present to give to the subject, that that principle would be interfered with by one of the body appealing upon the particular subject of the character of the religious teaching to the bishop, if such an appeal were given by the trust deed. The body of managers were to act in conformity with the trust deed. They were bound, therefore, to carry out the teaching which was prescribed in the trust deed, and if it so happened that the judge of the teaching was the bishop, there must be, there ought to be, an appeal by individual members of that body, or from anybody outside that body, to the bishop to know whether these trustees were carrying out the duties imposed upon them by the trust in accordance with the trust. He was not, therefore, at all clear that as a part of the general policy they ought to destroy the appeal to the bishop on the subject of dismissal, always allowing that that appeal was strictly confined to those particular religious questions on which the trust deed had laid it down that there should be an appeal. He must again repeat that he did not feel he should be acting fairly by the Committee if he were to permit himself, he would not say to be rushed, but to be lured, into a definite statement of policy on a subject which undoubtedly presented many points of difficulty.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS desired to say that the effect of giving the right of appeal here would be that, wherever they got an agreement between the vicar and the bishop, they could dismiss the teacher, although the other five members of the management committee might be against it.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N. W.) pointed out that the reason why the bishop should not be the court of appeal was that the case as presented to the bishop would be not the statement of the committee of management but the statement of the clergyman or curate who himself took exception to the religious teaching of the teacher in question. He thought there was a chance of grave injustice being done in this way.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said it was quite impossible for him to accept the Amendment of the noble Lord opposite to his Amendment, and if he supported it he would necessarily be voting against his own Amendment. The Amendment as amended would stereotype and make law that which was perhaps doubtful law at the present moment. The hon. and learned Member then referred to a passage in a form of trust deed used since 1870 which, he argued, clearly gave the power of dismissal of a teacher absolutely to the bishop. That was the state of things the noble Lord's Amendment was intended to perpetuate, and if the Amendment were persisted in and carried he would have to vote against his own proposal.

MR. BRYCE invited the First Lord of the Treasury to give the Committee some indication of his view before this matter was decided. He fully recognised the difficulty of the position, but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would state whether he would oppose the Amendment of the noble Lord.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he should certainly oppose the Amendment as amended.

LORD HUGH CECIL, in view of the Prime Minister's statement, asked leave to withdraw his Amendment to the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE asked when the right hon. Gentleman would give an indication of his opinion. The point was, that the power given to the local education authority and the managers by Clause 8 appeared from the trust deeds to be infringed in a material respect.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not the education authority?

MR. BRYCE: Yes, because there is an appeal to them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought there could be no difficulty on the secular side; it was only on the religious side that difficulty might arise.

MR. BRYCE said the theory of the Bill was that in religious matters the managers were supreme, and also that they should act as a whole. It was clear that the trust deeds overbore that principle so far that the managers would not act as a whole, because the clergyman or his curate had a separate power of going to the bishop. Nor would they act conclusively at all, because the decision of the bishop would operate as a dismissal. Two important issues were raised—first, as to whether it could be said that the managers acted as a whole, and, secondly, whether they could be said to have the control and dismissal. Those two issues would have to be faced. The question could not be left to be settled by the law courts. It would be a reflection on the House of Commons if, after their attention had been called to it, they passed the Bill without settling the question one way or the other. The Committee ought to know at what stage the right hon. Gentleman would announce the view of the Government, and whether an opportunity would be secured to the House for dealing with the question instead of leaving it to be the sport of legal proceedings hereafter.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS suggested that the Amendment should be withdrawn on condition that the Government promised to deal with the matter by putting on the Paper an Amendment to be considered on the Report stage. The question ought to be settled before the Bill went to another place.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not at all certain that an Amendment was required, but if one was necessary it ought clearly to be put down as a Government Amendment. He agreed that it would be a pity that the matter should be deferred until the Bill had left the House.

MR. BRYCE assumed that there would be an opportunity of discussing the Amendment, which would probably be on Clause 8.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That would probably be the place for the Amendment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON thought it would be unnecessary to go to a division, as the Government had promised to deal with the matter by an Amendment of their own, if necessary, and they could so arrange the business of the House as to ensure the Amendment being reached and discussed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There I must interrupt the hon. Gentleman. I should greatly regret it if Clause 8 was not discussed on Report, but I am not master of the situation.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: At all events, we have the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that on Report he will put down an Amendment dealing with this question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If such an Amendment is required.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: And that he will do his best to have it brought to discussion?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Then I will ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

MR. A. K. LOYD explained that the word he had quoted were from the form of trust deed issued by the Board of Education 1845-1870, and he had called attention to them for the purpose of showing that there were very good words giving the valuable power of stating a case. He would point out, however, that both in the deed which he had read, and in the form quoted by the hon. Member for Dundee, it was an optional power given to the minister or any other member of the committee to go to the bishop. Therefore, this valuable power, by which the parties to a dispute could get a first rate opinion on a matter of doctrine, was only to be put into force if desired.

Amendment to proprosed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth), in moving an Amendment of which notice had been given by the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight, said the trust deeds of a certain school required the school to be conducted by managers belonging to the denominational body which owned the school. Under the Bill there would be two managers who might belong to some other religious body. It was evident from the Measure itself that there was no desire that those outside or alien managers should have any voice in the control of the denominational or religious teaching, so that his Amendment might be looked upon merely as a drafting Amendment, and one which the Government could accept.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 27, at end, to insert: '(5) Where the receipt by a school, or the trustees or managers of a school, of any endowment or other benefit is, at the time of the passing of this Act, dependent on any qualification of the managers, the qualification of the foundation managers only shall, in case of question, be regarded.'"—(*Mr. Reginald Lucas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he understood his hon. friend's desire to be that, where an endowment or some other benefit came to a school, so long as the managers were of a particular denomination, that school should not be deprived of that benefit, if the foundation managers were of the necessary denomination, by reason of the fact that the representative of the local authority, or the minor local authority was a

Nonconformist, or of some other religious denomination other than that to which the benefit applied. On behalf of the Government he was prepared to accept the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

(5.28.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 225; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 563.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconachie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir MarkJ. M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHnJ.G. (Oxf'rdUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxeth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, CharlesP. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, SirCharlesM. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, RtHn. C.R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, W. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

*(5.38.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The new Clause which I have now to propose gives to the local authority power to continue the charging of fees in respect of a public elementary school not provided by the local education authority, and the local authority will have power to apportion the school fees between itself and the managers. It will be one of the duties of the local education authority to provide free places when required for the children of the population of those areas, but for various reasons and in various places, and, to a considerable extent, fees have been charged and are being charged at the present time. They are charged for various purposes; in some places to raise the quality of the teaching, for the provision of apparatus and other purposes, in other places, especially in poorer localities where there are very often no subscribers, and where the people are willing to contribute to the maintenance of the school. The new Clause which is down on the Paper in my name will enable this payment of fees to go on if the local authority thinks it is desirable that they should continue to be charged. This new Clause, however, leaves it very optional, because, in the first place, free places are to be provided in every area, and no one need pay the fees unless they choose.

In the next place, the local authority need not allow fees to be charged, but if it does allow them to be charged, they may be apportioned between the managers and the local authority. The local authority may think it desirable, in the interests of the area, that the managers should continue the fees, but if it does not think so, the result may be that the schools may cease to be non-provided schools and become provided schools, and be thrown wholly upon the rates. This may be a matter for the local authority to consider, and if it thinks it is desirable to do so, it may withdraw the right to charge fees altogether. This Clause leaves it optional to the local authority, and it may be very desirable during the period of transition that fees should continue to be charged. The voluntary schools will no longer receive the Parliamentary grants to deal with at their own discretion, but they will simply be the recipients of such money as the local authority thinks fit to give them, and will have to maintain the fabric outside and in with money provided from other sources. This will ease off the situation to the new schools which will come under the new *régime*, and I think it will be for the advantage of the local authority that it should have the option which my new Clause provides.

New Clause—

"To insert as a new Clause, after Clause 10:—'Where before the passing of this Act fees have been charged in any public elementary school not provided by the local education authority, that authority shall, while they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, pay such proportion of those fees as may be agreed upon, or, in default of agreement, determined by the Board of Education, to the managers.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. BRYCE said he could not see upon what ground the Government justified this proposal that voluntary schools should have these funds from the ratepayers in addition to the funds they would get from the letting of the school-house and the endowments. This appeared to him to be an entire departure from what they understood to be the general terms upon which the Bill was brought in, namely, that the cost of repairs should be defrayed by the managers. He should like to know from the Secretary to the Board of Education whether this money from the fees would go to the repairs.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had no objection to a local authority taking fees if it thought fit, but what he did very strongly object to was that the local authority should be compelled to hand over a portion of those fees to the managers of the schools. He did not know whether he might be permitted to call this a cool proposal, because that might irritate the Prime Minister. If he spoke his mind about this Clause he should be compelled to call it a very impudent proposal. They found a new proposal introduced every day to enable the Church of England to shake off the obligations it had undertaken at the commencement of this controversy. It was said that this was to "ease off" the obligation to keep up the fabric of the schools out of voluntary contributions. [Laughter.] That seemed to amuse the Prime Minister. The local authorities were to hand over a portion of the fees paid by the parents, and if they did not hand over enough the Board of Education was to be called in to determine the question in dispute. What were the fees? They were contributions from the parish in aid of the maintenance of education, and had been so from the beginning. The Under Secretary must be aware that when the Education Act of 1891 was passed, many managers took the 10s. grant, in some cases to wipe out fees altogether, and then turned round and asked the parents to continue them by way of voluntary contributions. What did the hon. Baronet the Member for Cambridge University at once say? He sent out a circular to the managers stating that they must not in any way collect money from the parents as voluntary contributions in respect of the fees which had hitherto been paid. What fees had been paid had been paid for the purpose of relieving the locality from the necessity of a School Board rate. The hon. Member instanced Stockport, where there was no local rate for school purposes, and where the parents were charged 6s. 8d. per child for fees. It raised over and above the 6s. 8d. per child for fees, 1s. 4d. per child by way of voluntary contribution. Portsmouth, on the other hand, had a school rate which amounted to 14s. 9d. per child, but there were no school fees. Where there was a rate fees were non-existent or very small. Now all those localities were going to pay rates, and the parents who were to be rated were to be called upon to pay fees. At any rate they should not be called upon to pay over a portion of the fees to the managers of the voluntary schools for the purpose of meeting the obligation originally put upon them to maintain the fabric. The Bishop of London had said that the keeping up of the fabric was the weak spot in the bargain. He would quote what the Parliamentary Secretary said on the 7th of May:—

> "The voluntary schools are there, and they can only pass away at a great expense to the community, and by giving a great shock to the religious feelings of many. Their maintenance becomes simply a question of terms, and the question is whether the terms offered by this Bill are fair. . . . Are the terms fair?"

And then he went on to answer that to his own satisfaction. If that did not suggest a bargain, then he did not know the meaning of the English language. What were the terms of that bargain? It was about time that they were examining them, having regard to the way in which on one side they were being whittled away. In 14,000 out of 20,000 schools they were to have the privilege of having denominational teaching thrown upon the public funds entirely, and so far as the rate was concerned—a thing entirely novel in the educational history of this country—the public was to find eleven-twelfths of the money required. The public was to hand over 14,000 out of 20,000 headmasters to be subjected to a denominational test. These denominationalists were to have the full use of the buildings on Saturday and Sunday and four nights a week for their own purposes, and the Church was to keep up the fabric. He thought that was a very fair statement of the bargain. He protested that ever since this bargain was struck, the Church had been repenting of the part she entered into. Every day revealed some Amendment on the Paper, showing that the Church desired to whittle away some part of the obligation solemnly entered into as far back as 1895, when the Prime Minister received a deputation from the Archbishop's Committee. A great deal of this Bill found its origin then. Last Tuesday the Prime Minister submitted a Clause under which it would be possible to divert the operation of the endowments.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no question of diversion.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that matter was debated last Tuesday and he did not mean to go into it now. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education had told the Committee that educational endowments of a general character could be diverted to the upkeep of the fabric. He did not think that specific statement could be denied. That was a pull of £150,000 to begin with. He found that there were 8,500 teachers' residences, and he estimated the average rental at £5, which he thought was a moderate estimate. That would give the Church a pull of £40,000. Then the fees in the non-provided schools represented £199,000, and it should be observed that some of these fees were paid on behalf of poor law children living in the workhouse. In addition to that, the Board of Education had this year decided that fees should be obligatory in night schools, upsetting the wise policy of wiping out fees in these schools. These various items made up a sum of £500,000 on which the Church would have a considerable pull under the Bill. It was a little mean and shabby to drive this hard bargain with the public in respect of the Church's obligations. He confessed that he did not think the Church was doing itself very much good by this daughter-of-the-horse-leech pestering of the Government to find a few more pence. He commiserated the Prime Minister on the hard taskmaster he had behind him. What would be the result? The great bulk of the voluntary subscriptions which were now raised would be safely put aside for a building fund to provide new denominational schools, which was easily possible under the ingenious accommodation schemes of the Bill. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] That he believed to be the purport of the Bill, and he was entitled to state his opinion. What would the local authorities do if they had their chance? Here he believed the Church would over-reach itself, if the Bill had not been ingeniously changed within the last two or three weeks. The local authority would have been entitled to say to the managers: "Go away, we will not deal with you, but build a school of our own." But they could not do that now. The dice were loaded against the local authority. The local authority would then say: "We will not haggle in the old way. Things have circled round. We considered it a fair thing that the fees should have been given in relief of the rates and obligations of an obscure little parish, with its own little school building. But we are obliged to thrust the obligation on your parish to build its own school out of its own small rate." Could it be wondered at if, in these circumstances, the local authority were compelled to pocket their irritation, and accept the denominational school? If the Courts were straightforward, one result would be that the voluntary schools would disappear. The Courts, however, would not deal with the managers in that way; and the Bill was ingeniously devised to avoid that contingency. He sincerely hoped that he was not a true prophet, and that the Church would over-reach itself, and that they would saddle a small parish with the capital charge of another building. He did not know which he was most amazed at—the cupidity of the Church, or the pusillanimity of the Government, which, step by step, during the last few weeks had whittled down the obligations of the rich Church of England.

*(6.8.) SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N. E.) said he had not troubled the Committee much on this Bill, but he could not forbear saying a few words in answer to the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, part of which had taken him by surprise. He had always endeavoured to put the best construction on the motives of Gentlemen who differed from him. The hon. Gentleman had sometimes in debate adopted a judicial tone in moderate language, and with a fair interpretation of the opinions from which he differed; but on the present occasion he had used the most extravagant language. A few of his phrases were: "Audacious proposal," "cupidity," "the horse-leech," "loaded dice." He could only attribute such language to sectarian animosity. The hon. Member and his friends would like to strip the voluntary schools of every possible means of support, so that they might fall helpless victims into the hands of those who wished to sweep them away, because they regarded religious education as an evil. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] The hon. Member who attempted to argue this point against the Government took the narrowest possible view of the case. He said that the levying of fees was to obviate the necessity of rates.

DR. MACNAMARA: No, I said that would be the effect.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Well, that would be the effect. The narrowest and most confined view could apply only where there was no School Board. In the constituency with which he had to do, the majority of the parents of the children preferred such an education as was given in the voluntary schools. There they found voluntary schools in which the parents were paying fees for their children, although there were board schools not more than 200 or 300 yards off. The language of the hon. Gentleman was perfectly inapplicable to such cases. It should be remembered that those who subscribed to the voluntary schools had to pay the rates all the same. It was well-known that in Lancashire a much larger number of children were educated in voluntary schools than in any other part of England. What was the proposal which the hon. Gentleman said was so audacious? It was that the fees paid by the parents should be given towards the up-keep of these schools. Why should part of the fees, which parents voluntarily paid, not be given back towards the up-keep of these schools? The hon. Gentleman had lost sight of the case of London, where the voluntary schools were competing with the board schools, and where the parents sometimes paid fees. For his part he should say that this was a most modest proposal. They had heard a great deal about the refusal of the Church party and Church managers to fulfil their obligations, and the bargain which they were supposed to have made. Well, the managers must have some sort of revenue in order to maintain their schools. He was acquainted with many schools where the clergy had the greatest difficulty in keeping them going, and where they could hardly do so without the fees. He had a list of thirty schools in Manchester, and twelve in Salford, where the fees were greatly in excess of the voluntary subscriptions, and if those fees were to be entirely alienated from the purpose for which they were paid, it was evident that the funds available would fall short of the requirements, and that would be a capital means of starving the schools into submission.

DR. MACNAMARA: They will come on the rates.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said that the parents had paid their rates all these years, whether they sent their children to the board schools or not, and it was only a matter of justice that at least half the fees should be handed over to the managers of the voluntary schools. He was not one of those who said that religious education was an evil *per se*, and he desired to see it maintained.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said he wanted to say two or three words in regard to the new Clause, which he had only seen that morning, and which he confessed took him very much by surprise. The House, and the country, distinctly understood that the subscribers to the voluntary schools were going to maintain the fabric of the schools. The Prime Minister had told them so, and the Bill had also told them so, in as plain language as possible. But now it appeared that the money for the purpose was, to a large extent, to be supplied to the subscribers and the managers, and in proportion as the money was provided from other sources, the subscribers and the managers would not have to maintain the fabric of the schools. In that respect, the country and the House had certainly been led astray. From his point of view he thought the Church herself would suffer extremely from that form of sharp practice. He thought the conscience of the country would be pricked. This Amendment was a very serious thing, and the conscience of the man in the street would show itself more sensitive than the conscience of the representatives of national affairs. Did the Church want it? Had she asked for it? Would she be content to stoop so low as to receive it? He wanted someone who held the honour of the Church dear to rise up and denounce this proposal as something unclean. He had no objection whatever to the Church receiving this money, or ten times the amount, provided she could receive it with clean hands, but he had the greatest objection to her receiving any money illicitly—which was the result of a broken understanding. The understanding was as clear as possible when the Bill was introduced. It was that the fabrics were not to be maintained in the way in which they had been under this Bill. He thought it was a serious thing for any Church, and the national Church worst of all, in any way to play fast and loose with the nation. If this Clause was passed it would be a blot on the fair fame of the Church of England, and a stigma on the divine cause of which she was the exponent, and it would be remembered against her; it might be remembered some time hence, when the question of disestablishment came up for discussion. On the lowest ground, upon the most gross ground that could be put forward—self interest—he did not think the Church could afford to receive it. It would injure her temporality and her spirituality. He hoped some of the strong men who were the spokesmen of the Church would rise up and say that they did not wish to have anything to do with this Clause. At any rate he felt very strongly that the Church herself ought to have time to consider whether, upon moral grounds, she should accept, or (as he thought) should reject this offer.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford) said he was disposed to think the hon. Member who had just sat down was not very well informed upon this question. He would give the Committee some information as to the relative cost of buildings and the relative cost of maintenance. It was the custom in this Committee to treat maintenance as if it were all important and the buildings as nothing of any consequence. In the area of the School Board of Salford, which embraced 14,000 children, the teachers' salaries and appliances amounted to £16,000 a year, the interest on loans for buildings amounted to £11,000. Those figures were very different to the figures supplied by the hon. Member for North Camberwell.

DR. MACNAMARA: What is the cost of the up-keep of the fabric?

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS: The use of these buildings, which cost £10,000 a year, would be given for nothing. Then there was the question of repairs; what he understood was that the amount to be paid for repairs was the amount previously paid by the managers for repairs. The portion set aside for repairs necessitated by the use of the school for two hours on a Sunday as a Sunday school they did not ask the Government to pay, but they did ask that the Church should be put on the same footing as the Nonconformists. The Nonconformists were put in at a certain rate, and the Church asked that she should be put in at the same rate for repairs. The wear and tear of a school used for two hours on a Sunday was very different to the wear and tear of the school for five hours a day all the week. All that they asked was that the local authority should pay the tenants' repairs and the Church the Sunday school repairs. The people who paid a penny a week in the shape of a school fee had been referred to. The hon. Gentleman might laugh and sneer, but he thought those people who paid a penny a week in order that their children should be taught in a Church of England school were entitled to better treatment than they had received up to now. With regard to endowments, he had looked through the list, and found that out of forty-five schools they had only two endowments, which only amounted to £30 a year, and there were no teachers' houses.

(6.25.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Member who had just spoken had told the Committee it was not honourable on their part to sneer at the parents who gave their penny a week by way of fees for their children's education, and that they were entitled to respect. He (Mr. Lloyd-George) on the previous day had proposed that the parents should not only get respect but a voice in the management. That was a most substantial token of respect, and not mere lip respect, across the floor of the House. And his recollection was that the hon. Member who now denounced them for their disrespect for the penny-a-week parent voted against that proposal.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS: He must necessarily have a vote.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was not his proposal. His proposal was that a voice should be given to a parent who sent his child to a school. That was not the only case in which the hon. Gentleman had shown his respect for the penny-a-week gentlemen. On every occasion when they asked for more control for the parent, he was found in the lobby voting it down. Whenever they asked for a voice to be given to the parent, the hon. Member said "Oh no, we prefer that other people should speak for him." The hon. Member said something about Salford. If he made such mistakes as he had in the figures with regard to that town, what mistake would he not make with regard to the rest of the country? He had said that the cost of repairs there was £11,000.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS said the School Board had borrowed certain sums to build schools, and those sums amounted to £11,000 in the year.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the hon. Member did not understand the figures he was quoting, or he did not understand this Clause. In the sum he had quoted they had the loan interest and repayment of capital as well. All this Clause dealt with was the cost of repairs. The hon. Gentleman had thrown a very curious sidelight upon the denominational position. He had pointed out that the wear and tear of the schools on Sunday was as nothing to the wear and tear of schools on week days, when for five hours a day there were three or four times as many children in them as there were on Sunday. That supported the contention which the Opposition had always pressed, that these were not denominational schools at all; that they were State Schools to which children of other denominations went, the control of which was in the hands of a minority in the locality. The hon. baronet the Secretary to the Board of Education asked as to the poor districts where there were no subscriptions and where the fees paid by the parents represented the subscriptions. In that case the parent was a subscriber, and he asked again, if the parents represented the subscribers of the district and were in fact the subscribers of the district, why should they be deprived of the right which every other subscriber had got of electing the managers. The Government could not have it both ways; if they said the parent in this case was a subscriber, they could not say "He shall have none of the privileges that other subscribers have, he shall only bear the burden." He congratulated the hon. Member for North Camberwell upon his pointing out the results which were being obtained by means of the guillotine Resolution. The Bill was being changed without any opportunity being given to discuss it. He was amused to hear the hon. Baronet the Member for one of the Divisions of Manchester denounce his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwall as a narrow sectarian bigot. He had never been able to discover what his hon. friend's convictions were, though he believed he was a manager of a voluntary school in conjunction with the Archbishop of Canterbury. If that was narrow sectarianism, it was the narrow sectarianism of the hon. Baronet's own faith. The whole thing was unfair to the country, and it was very unfair to the Committee that a Bill should be brought in, that the Committee should discuss it for weeks and weeks, that a Resolution should then be tabled which made discussion impossible, and that then Amendments should be introduced by the Government which changed the whole character of the Bill. After all, discussion, thorough discussion, and even the consumption of time, was the most potent weapon the Opposition possessed, and once deprived of that weapon they were powerless. When the Prime Minister went to the country in the recess he foreshadowed Amendments to strengthen control, but never said a word about giving endowments to the repair of the fabrics, and above all he never said a word about establishing convent schools and withdrawing them from the control of the authority. This was done by the next Clause to be discussed, a Clause only put on the Paper a few hours previously. During the recess there had been a free and open discussion. Meetings were held. The Prime Minister consulted his constituents at Manchester, and the Colonial Secretary consulted his, under lock and key, at Birmingham, and the result of those consultations was that promises were made to strengthen the control. But the bishops got frightened, and assembled in their multitudes, with their friends; they flourished their croziers at the Government and flung Kenyon-Slaney at the head of the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister got unnerved. He congratulated the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, who need not look so innocent, upon the way in which he had done it, for he was at the bottom of the whole conspiracy. The noble Lord did not look the part, but what had he done? He had denounced the Prime Minister for overthrowing the trusts, and had attacked him for having accepted the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. What was it all done for? It was done to keep the Prime Minister up to the mark. It was part of the Albert Hall business from start to finish. What was given away at Birmingham and Manchester was taken back at Albert Hall. The Bill had been completely changed. His hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell had been too moderate. It was absurd to say that £5 was even an adequate ground rent, as ground rents now were, for a teacher's house, let alone an adequate rent. He knew some of these teachers' houses, and very excellent houses they were. He did not believe they would get any subscriptions after the Bill was passed. The £120,000 for endowments, the £200,000 for fees, the £170,000 for rent of the school houses, if the rack-rent was charged—£500,000 a year altogether—would be handed over to the Church to pay for the repairs. The usual charge for the repairs of a building was 10 per cent. Even if it was put at 20 per cent., the rate at which the

Bishop of London himself put it, only £150,000 a year would be required for repairs, yet this was the bargain! As the matter stood now this was the latest edition of the bargain with regard to which the other party had not been consulted. £500,000 was given to the Church towards repairs, which cost only £150,000, so that £350,000 a year out of the rate imposed to maintain the education of the country was to be handed over to the richest Church in the world. And taking into consideration the fact that the country had never been consulted in the matter, this was nothing less than a fraud upon the electors of the country.

MR. WHITLEY said the action of the Government in putting down these Clauses after the guillotine Resolution had been passed was an action to which the Committee ought not to be subjected. To all intents and purposes by this Clause they were making a fresh endowment of the Church. The Clause provided that the local authority might continue to exact fees where fees were now paid, which would be handed over to the managers, who would, of course, apply the money to what the bishops called the "parochial purposes." Where had the principle of "rent free" gone to? So far, the managers of the voluntary schools had the whip hand. They could say to the local authority, "Unless you continue to charge fees and allow us so much out of them, we will throw the cost of this school upon the parish." This Clause was a compulsory power to extract fees from the parents in the first place, and from the local authority in the second. The Government had gone back, under pressure, on the understanding on which they introduced the Bill, and on which they presented it to the country. What they gave on the one hand they had taken back with the other. The hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Board said this Clause was introduced "to ease the situation." What was the situation that required easing in this indirect manner? It was a situation the hon. Baronet had previously described. He had said the managers should be assisted, because the rich subscribers would not subscribe sufficiently. The hollowness and the sham of all the talk of the desire of the parents had now come to an end. The system of the Government was assuming a character suitable to the title of the National Society for the Education of the Children of the Poor in the Principles of the Church of England. That was at the bottom of the whole business. The words of the hon. Member for North Camberwell were not in any way too strong for this proposal. It was outrageous that by a side wind they should be asked to leave these local authorities in many cases with no option but that of imposing a heavy rate for building on a small parish ill able to bear it or of compelling parents to pay fees in respect of these schools, such fees being handed over to the managers without a word as to the purpose for which they were to be used. In addition to the great relief from subscriptions given by this Bill, amounting to £800,000 a year, the chief managers were to have these fees, and yet the Church was not satisfied. The cry was "More, more, more." He was quite sure that the result would be to damage that Church which proudly called herself the Church of England—the national Church—but which represented not one-half of the nation. The avarice, the grasping nature of the claims which the Church had put forward, and which had been pressed upon the Government, would do that Church more harm than it had suffered in any of the controversies of the last hundred years.

*MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) believed that the violent language which had been used with regard to the Clause would turn out in the long run to be "much ado about nothing." He was pretty confident that the cases would be few, if any such cases there were, where the local authority, when in working order, would continue to charge fees even in schools where it had been the practice to charge them hitherto and where the fees had been willingly and voluntarily paid. If fees were charged it would not be in the rural schools, because fees were not charged in these schools to any great extent. But fees were charged in Church of England schools in very poor districts, where there were no rich subscribers and where the payments that had to be met by the managers had to be met, if at all, by fees willingly paid by the parents. He said "willingly," because in some parishes, where there was a choice of schools, parents preferred to pay the fees in order that they might send their children to a school which gave the instruction they liked. He could understand the local authority in such cases, seeing that parents in a district evidently preferred denominational teaching, saying "What are we to do?" In these particular districts managers have nothing to look to for the upkeep of the buildings but voluntary subscriptions in the shape of these fees, which parents have shown themselves willing to pay. We have such a clear manifestation of the wish of the inhabitants that respect should be paid to it, and these schools continued as voluntary schools. On the opposite side many Members tried to mislead the House by talking about the riches of the Church. They said it was the richest Church in Christendom—as if that had anything to do with the question with which the Committee were dealing. The endowments of the Church were expended upon buildings and salaries of ministers. The riches of the Church for other purposes in a particular district depended upon the riches of the Churchpeople in that district. the whole basis of his argument was that in many districts there were no rich Churchpeople. The inhabitants were all poor people who were willing to give out of their poverty in order that they might have the kind of education they desired. In such cases, if the local authority came to the conclusion that in order to gratify the desire of the inhabitants of the district it would be better that the voluntary schools should be maintained, they might in the last resort, there being no subscriptions of the ordinary kind, consent to the continuance of the fees. If they did that they could only do it with the intention that the people who used the schools, continue to contribute to their upkeep should and in such a case nothing could be fairer than that they should pay over to the managers about as much as they were in the habit of expending out of the fees up to the time that schools were taken over, for the purpose of maintaining the fabric and effecting current repairs. If he had presented the case fairly, as he had endeavoured to do, where was the ground for all this violent indignation? After what he had said he hoped that even his hon. friend would feel that the Church might, without a stain on her conscience, receive such benefit as the Clause proposed to give her, and that the hon. Member for North Camberwell, whose moderation and ability in these debates he was ready to recognise, would regret, on further consideration, that he had been betrayed into unusual and unseemly violence.

Mr. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) did not wish to associate himself with some of the language which had been used in reference to the Church of England in relation to this matter. There was no evidence to show that it emanated from, or that it was approved by the Church of England. But he did desire to associate himself with the hon. Member for North Birmingham in his arguments against the proposal, and to express his regret that such a Clause should have been put forward by the Government. An attempt had been made to excuse the proposal on the ground that it was comparatively trifling, but, in his view, the smallness of the amount was an additional reason for not accepting an unsound principle. What would the managers require this money for, except repairs or improvements? Clause 18, however, provided that the managers should, out of "funds provided by them," keep the school house in good repair, and make necessary alterations and improvements. Surely that meant out of funds provided by private sources; not out of funds provided by the school children. This stipulation was being inserted by a side wind to provide the managers with a source of revenue out of money given for educational purposes. The present proposal, as it seemed to him, undid the effect of Clause 18. He did not think it was fair. and he would vote against it.

(7.0.) Mr. BRYCE said he noticed that no member of the Government had risen to reply. All that had been said by the hon. Member for the Exchange Division was perfectly true. The Church of England did not desire this change. He was glad to hear the hon

Member for the Exchange Division and the hon. Member for North Birmingham repudiate the contention that this proposal had been demanded by the Church of England. This proposal was the work of a small section of persons who, in their passionate ardour for denominational instruction, were prepared to go to all lengths, and had unfortunately obtained the ear of the Government. He did not believe that the Church of England as a whole either desired or approved of that policy. When the Bill was first introduced the First Lord of the Treasury said that the managers of voluntary schools would be required to devote their buildings to educational purposes, to keep them in good repair, and to make all reasonable alterations and improvements. Upon every occasion when the question of denominational schools came up in June and July last for discussion, the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury said that the managers would have to pay the cost of repairs. That was constantly repeated as a serious burden upon the managers, and he believed that argument had great force at the time. Whether they called it a bargain or a concordat, this Bill had been understood as being an arrangement by which the rates were to bear the cost of maintenance of education in voluntary schools on the understanding that the managers would bear the cost of the repairs. That was the case until the House met in October last, and since then the position had entirely changed. First they had, upon the introduction of an Amendment by a private Member which was accepted by the Government, provision to give the rent of the school houses to the managers; then they had a new Clause dealing with the endowments, and now the Government were making this provision with regard to the fees. Those were three most material departures from the declarations of the First Lord of the Treasury which he made in the earlier months of the session. This proposal was now introduced on the very eve of the ending of the Committee stage. He did not desire to use any stronger language, but he thought they had a right to complain that the understanding under which the Bill was introduced in the first instance had been wholly departed from, and he noticed that no defence was offered by the Government. He agreed with the hon. Members for North Birmingham and the Exchange Division of Liverpool that these changes would injure the Church of England, would be an offence to local authorities, and would certainly be a very powerful stimulus to those who desired to repeal the whole of these provisions which they believed to be unjust and oppressive.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: As the right hon. Gentleman opposite has complained that no member of the Government has defended this modest proposal, I will do so myself. But modest and useful as I believe my proposal to be, I was fully prepared for the outbreak which has occurred on the other side. I was fully prepared for the volume of statistics with which the hon. Member for North Camberwell always illuminates his arguments. I may say, however, that I was hardly prepared for the extreme violence of the language used by the hon. Member. Such language, must, however, have some opportunity for utterance, and I am not surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite are seizing the last occasion when these matters come before the House. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"] Well—the last occasion this week. I think hon. Members opposite will enjoy the week-end more completely if they thoroughly relieve their minds upon these matters. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have again referred to a bargain, the existence of which I need hardly say has been repudiated by the Prime Minister; and as one of the humblest members of the Government at the other end of the scale, may I equally be allowed to repudiate altogether any knowledge of a bargain. The hon. Member for North Camberwell quoted some words of mine in which I spoke of terms. It is true that I spoke of terms, but it was in this sense—that we are creating a new and double ownership of the schools. The managers are bound to provide the fabric both outside and in for the use of the local education authority for the purposes of these schools. The managers are, however, bound to give up the use of the building for three nights a week, and that was not part of the original scheme. They are also bound to submit to the complete financial control of the local education authority, to the complete control of their secular instruction, and to representation on the board of management. That is what the managers have to do on their side. On the other side, the local education authority provide the salaries of the teachers, furniture, school books, and so forth. That being so, it does seem reasonable, and no departure at all from anything in the original scheme of the Bill, that the various sources of income which are actually coming to the school as a school shall, as they come in, to some extent, be divided and shared between the local education authority and the managers. These fees, it has been said, were originally paid in mitigation of the rates. If they were then, they will still be so paid, because they will continue the existence of a non-provided school, whereas provided schools are necessarily a heavier charge upon the rates of the area. These fees are paid by the parents in support of a particular school and in support of a school of a particular character to which the parents desire to send their children. Is there anything unjust if some portion of the money which the parents give towards the continued existence of a school of a particular character should be contributed to the maintenance of the fabric, outside and in, of that particular school? Really the indignation which has been expressed seems to me to have been somewhat misplaced, as also have been the unfavourable comments made upon my remarks that this arrangement of fees, at any rate for a year or so to come, would, as I described it, ease off the situation. What is the position of these non-provided schools? The first impression will be that voluntary subscriptions are no longer necessary, and they will not flow in as liberally as before. In the first instance there will be that impression, and I do anticipate an immediate falling off in this respect. Then it must be borne in mind that these schools will not be allowed to use the Parliamentary grants, and, more particularly, the aid grant, for the maintenance of their buildings. That they will no longer enjoy after this Bill comes into force, because all those Parliamentary grants will go into the hands of the local education authority and will be pooled, and the managers will receive no more than is necessary for the secular instruction of the schools. And, lastly, the managers have been accustomed in many parts of the country to make something towards the upkeep of the school and its maintenance by the use of the school, either in the way of letting the building or using it for remunerative purposes of their own. In the future they will have the school taken away from them under this Bill for three evenings in the week. For these and other reasons I believe it will be good policy on the part of the local education authority to continue to allow the managers to charge fees and to share those fees, as the Clause provides. I believe the arrangement to be convenient and just, and I am prepared to defend it against the indignation to which some hon. Members have given expression.

*MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he desired to emphasise the arguments which had been submitted by hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. Not one substantive or adjective had been used with every syllable of which he did not agree. He spoke as one outside the Anglican communion; he spoke as a member of a body who under the Clause would receive some monetary advantage. The Wesleyan body, he believed, had never been consulted on this Clause, and if they were he fancied the proposal would be thrown back in the face of the Government with contempt. They had in their schools for years past charged fees, and their people had been prepared to pay fees because of the high standard of education they had maintained. They had been, on their part, prepared to hand over to the public authority the use of their buildings on terms laid down in the Bill without any sense of dissatisfaction, and, he believed, with a greater sense of generosity than had been shown by the Anglican communion. But when a proposal was made that the fees which they received in their schools should not be handed over to the body which was to maintain their schools, but were to be received by the private managers for their own private purposes, he believed that to be outside the understanding come to when the Bill was first introduced. No concessions could justify the addition of these words to the Bill. On the Second Reading the present Secretary to the Board of Education told them that the terms were fair. He thought they were justified in saying that the Church had gone back on its bargain. [An HON. MEMBER: There was no bargain.] If there was no bargain what was the use of the word "terms"? One hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House had said that it was a just proposal. If it was a perfectly just proposal, why was it not put forward before? It was not put in the Bill at first, and therefore the Bill was either badly conceived in the interests of the Church of England or the Government had this proposal up its sleeve. If the latter proposition were accepted, the denunciation of his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell was absolutely justified. A fortnight ago the House by passing the Closure Resolutions practically gave the Government a blank cheque. The result had been that the Government had been filling up that blank cheques for large amounts ever since the Resolutions were passed. He did not wish to say a single word in denunciation of the Church of England—he had never done so in public or private—but any sober-minded man, whether in the Church or out of it, must see that the continued cry by the Church for more money was detrimental to the best interests of the Church.

*MR. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said he did not think that Nonconformists would treat with contempt any proposal which was likely to relieve those responsible for schools of a charge which might become a serious strain on the funds of the Churches that maintained the schools. He believed that those responsible for the Wesleyan day schools did not contemplate with unmixed feelings the prospect of the loss of the sum which they received in the form of rent, and which in Wesleyan schools amounted to £9,000 a year. This, together with the added cost of repairs of about £7,000 a year, would be a real difficulty. If any relief could be given from fees, where fees are charged, or other sources, he did not think a proposal of this kind would be unacceptable to them.

(7.15.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 207; Noes, 116. (Division List, No. 564.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Lord
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus

Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n)
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bell, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, John Thr'gmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

DR. MACNAMARA rose to move an Amendment to provide that fees if continued should be credited to the parish or parishes served by the school as a contribution in relief of the charge upon the rates for the purposes of elementary education. He had no objection to the local authority continuing fees, but he very strongly objected to their continuance if a proportion of the amount was to be paid to the managers of voluntary schools for various private purposes not known to him at present, except the keeping up of the fabric of the school.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening,

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

New Clause (Apportionment of school fees).

(9.0.) DR. MACNAMARA, continuing his speech, said he had no objection to the continuance of fees. That was a matter for the decision of the local education authority, who would know the particular circumstances. But what he did object to very strongly was that, if fees were charged, the money should be handed over to the managers. The Bill was quite clear on this matter. Clause 8 (*d*) laid it down that "the managers of the school shall, out of funds provided by them, keep the school in good repair," and so on. He desired to lay every possible stress on the words "out of funds provided by them." And now, under the pressure of a certain section of the Church of England, as he contended, the Government were proposing to whittle away the effect of those words. The Church of England repented of the bargain which had been made, finding it too onerous, and therefore the Government had come forward with a proposal to raid, to commandeer, the pence of the children amongst other things, in order to enable the managers to meet this obligation. The Bishop of London had said that the weak part of this bargain of the Government was the repairs. He understood now from the Secretary to the Board of Education that these voluntary subscriptions would fall off, and it was because of this that he now came forward with this new Clause.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I said that would be the first impression, and that I did anticipate an immediate falling off in voluntary subscriptions.

DR. MACNAMARA said that he might take it now that one of the reasons for the introduction of this Clause was that voluntary subscriptions were going to fall off. He thought that admission gave away the case. The subscriptions would fall off, and therefore the obligation that the manager should keep the school in good repair could not be carried out. Now it was proposed to raid the pence of the children in order to meet this obligation. As a manager of a voluntary school himself, he had no hesitation in characterising that as a mean and shabby thing. It had been said that the obligation imposed upon the managers to keep the school in good repair would prove to be a great strain, and that was put forward as a reason why hon. Gentlemen opposite now supported this commandeering of the pence of the children. That strain ought to have been thought of before. Why were there no Amendments put down on the Government side when it was first said down that the managers of the schools should, out of funds provided by them, keep the school in good repair? Upon the discussion of Clause 8, sub-Section (d) there was a speech delivered by the hon. Member for Stretford which admirably met his view. Upon that occasion the hon. Member said—

> "He quite agreed that the question of repairs was a very important one which ought to be dealt with according to the lines laid down in the Bill."

That was to say that the managers should, out of funds provided by them, keep the school in good repair. The hon. Member for Stretford went on to say:—

> "Here they were not dealing particularly with Church schools or denominational schools, but with all the schools not provided by the local authority, many of them being schools in private hands. He admitted that there was a heavy burden cast on the owners of the schools, but according to the principles of the Bill they should bear it in return for certain advantages obtained."

That was the speech by the hon. Member for the Stretford Division of Lancashire, who had been a very able supporter of the Government, more especially with regard to the financial part of this Bill, and he agreed that it was fair and just on the part of the Church that they should carry out this obligation. The hon. Member for Stretford further stated that:—

> "It would be a great mistake to attempt to make the burden too light, and certainly nothing could be worse than the recurrence of constant friction as to repairs."

And now he came to the Attorney General. Speaking on the 29th of October when this particular sub-Section (*d*) of Clause 8 was under discussion the Attorney General said:—

> "So far as repairs were concerned, both inside and out, the managers should keep the schools in a condition fit for educational purposes."

After getting a pull on the endowments and on the teachers' houses, why did the Government now come down and commandeer the pence of the children? The other right hon. Member opposite who, with the Secretary to the Board of Education, represented the Oxford University, speaking upon the same occasion said:—

> "What he had understood was that the fabric and its repairs were to be maintained by the owners, but that all else would be left in the hands of the local authority."

What had the pence of the children to do with the owners? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman opposite who represented Oxford University whether he still adhered to that statement that the repairs were to be maintained by the owners. But this was not the question of owners at all. The local authority might charge fees if it liked, but they ought to stick to the original bargain, or concordat, and see that the repairs were maintained out of funds provided by the managers, or, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University said, out of the funds provided by the owners. No one could contend that the parents were the owners of these buildings. Then there was a speech made by the hon. Member for Salford, who, he thought, rather misunderstood the situation, for he spoke of voluntary contributions for keeping the schools going. As a matter of fact, the contributions for the maintenance of voluntary schools were to disappear. He was glad to say that it was not now a question of starving the schools, and no one had been more strenuous in insisting that these schools should come upon the public funds for their maintenance than himself. The possibility of starving the schools now disappeared, because they were going to put the voluntary schools of Salford on the Salford rates, and he hoped they would pay up cheerfully, and he believed it would turn out to be the best investment they had ever made. The hon. Gentleman opposite had said what a great hardship it would be to prevent the use of this money because of the poverty of the schools. He was glad to say that the schools would be beyond poverty in the future, because they would be on the rates; but the point he was now dealing with was the up-keep of the fabric out of the funds provided by the owners. The Member for the Salford Division mentioned something about £11,000.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS: That was the expenditure for the building of board schools.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was not now dealing with the board schools but with the denominational schools. This £11,000 was he sum annually expended by the School Board of Salford as a sinking fund for the payment of interest on loans. He was not talking about these matters now, but about the up-keep of the fabric and repairs. He would take as an example the Salford voluntary schools. In the return to which the hon. Member referred, there was a statement in connection with the Salford voluntary schools which gave the amount expended up to the 31st of August, 1899, for fuel, lighting, cleaning, repairs, rent, and taxes. For all the voluntary schools in Salford for all these purposes, only one of which he was now dealing with, the whole expenditure was £8,491. If they took away the cost of fuel, lighting, cleaning, and rent, what amount would be left for repairs? Why should the Church be so anxious of its ability to meet that small item? He did not suppose that it would come to more than £1,000 a year, but surely in return for the right in Salford to have Church teaching given entirely at the public expense out of the rates and taxes, surely in return for the right to impose denominational tests upon the teachers and the right to use the Salford voluntary schools on Saturdays and Sundays for any purpose they liked and to use the public furniture free of cost, it was a very little thing to ask that they should stand by the original bargain with the managers of the schools, that out of funds provided by them they should keep the fabric in a good state of repair. He would go into one or two particulars with regard to the Salford voluntary schools. St. James' (Broughton) School, with an average attendance of 476 children, spent £86. 1s. 10d. on fuel, light, cleaning, repairs, rent and taxes. The corresponding figure for Cheetham Hill Wesleyan School, with over 300 children in average attendance, was £60 12s. 5d.; for Duke Street, Lower Broughton School, with an average attendance of 460, £86 3s. 1d.; of St. Andrew's National School, Lower Broughton, with an average attendance of 424, £58 1s. 11d. Taking even one-fourth of those amounts as being paid for repairs, could it be said that that was an onerous burden in return for all the concessions that had been made. And yet this small obligation was being whittled away! They had no right to say that fees were a form of voluntary contribution; if fees were continued they should go to the parish in relief of the local rate, as they had done in the past, and the managers should be kept to the original obligation under Clause 8 (*d*).

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 'shall,' in line 3, to end of the Clause, and insert the words 'if they think fit, abolish such school fees; but if they continue to charge fees in respect of that school, shall credit the parish or parishes served by the school with the amount of the school fees as a contribution in relief of the charge upon the rates for the purpose of Part III. of this Act.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS said the remarks of the hon. Member for North Camberwell were rather misplaced. There were in Salford Board schools 14,000 children and in voluntary schools 21,000. To form an estimate of the value of the schools contributed by the denominations he took the figures of the Salford School Board. For 14,000 children they paid £16,000 in teachers' salaries and for appliances. Maintained at the same rate, the voluntary school expenditure would be £25,000. All the time that was given to denominational teaching was an hour weekly, equivalent to a twenty-fifth part, or £1,000. That represented what the voluntary people were to receive. But what were they to give. For the building of the Board schools there was an expenditure of £11,000 a year. The voluntary schools in Salford, being half as many again as the Board schools, would therefore, on that basis, involve an expenditure of £16,000. That represented the amount given, and the return was £1,000. And yet the denominationalists were described as "Shylocks," and so forth! The circumstances did not warrant the epithets of mean and shabby. As to the repairs, the cost under the Salford School Board averaged 2s. 6d. per child. That would come to £2,500 on the number of children in the voluntary schools—not an inconsiderable sum. It would be a very difficult task to raise £100 a year in subscriptions in a poor district in Salford, where there were 800 children in the voluntary school. He therefore thought it would be a most unjustifiable proceeding to attempt to deprive the Salford denominations of the opportunity of allocating a share of these fees.

(9.28) MR. WHITLEY thought the First Lord of the Treasury ought clearly to understand that they on that side of the House felt very strongly the breach of the undertaking with which the Bill was introduced. It was clearly understood that the owners of voluntary schools were to keep up the fabric of the schools at their expense. The Prime Minister would recollect that he (the hon. Member) withdrew an Amendment on the question of the rent to be charged for voluntary schools, on the promise that the Government would introduce a Clause enacting that the schools should be provided rent free. He put it to the Prime Minister that it was not right or straight that a large sum should be withdrawn from one side of the account when they had settled the other side. What were these fees? They were part of the costs which had been paid by the ratepayers, and surely if the ratepayers were to be called upon to find the whole cost of maintenance, those fees ought to be credited to the ratepayers, and not to the managers. In fact, this Clause was a deliberate breach of the pledge which the Prime Minister had given. The Secretary to the Board of Education admitted the fact that this second condition of things would be final. The hon. Gentleman said that he did anticipate that the subscriptions would fall off after this Bill had passed, and he used the words, "that the managers should therefore be assisted." What did that mean? It was to ease off the situation. There were no two possible meanings to these words. The right hon. Member for North-East Manchester said that the poor managers would have nothing to fall back on except the voluntary subscriptions, but the right hon. Baronet also told the Committee that the subscriptions would fall off. This Clause was a violation of the three-times given pledge to the House, that the fees were to be returned by the managers to the local authority for the immense privileges they were getting. The Government were fixing the patronage and power to appoint in one of the leading professions of the country no less than 60,000 civil servants. He would like to know whether that was a patronage to be measured in pounds The fact was, that these fees would not be voluntarily paid on the part of the parents. If they were to be voluntary, why not accept the proposal of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, that if fees were charged by the local authority they ought to be credited to the rates of the parish in which the school was situated? The very fact that it was proposed that the local authority should, in the first instance, collect the fees without the parents knowing where they were going to, showed distinctly that, in this indirect way, the money would be provided for the up-keep of the non-provided schools. There was no getting out of the position that if the Government insisted on passing this Clause, they could no longer say that the managers of the voluntary schools were giving their schools rent free in return for the privileges they receive.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman had made an appeal to him on the subject of this Amendment, from which he gathered from the hon. Gentleman that he and others thought the Government had broken some promise or pledge, expressed or implied. The hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs declared that his noble friend the Member for Greenwich had made a series of attacks on the Government in order to keep them up to the mark. Well, if attacks had that effect, he must be a most up-to-the-mark person. They had heard a great deal about efficiency, and he could not imagine efficiency at a higher point if attacks from all quarters led to that most desirable result. He could assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Government in this matter had really not swerved from the general line of policy, on this or any other point, which was enunicated in the earlier stages of the Bill. The hon. Gentleman opposite, following the excellent example set by himself and many of his friends, had spoken at great length of a bargain which he said was made on the subject of the amount of assistance to be given to voluntary schools.

MR. WHITLEY said the words he used were "the understanding which was given to the House when the right hon. Gentleman introduced the Bill."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that in his last speech the hon. Gentleman might have called it an understanding, but on previous occasions he would not deny that he talked of a bargain. A bargain was between two people or two sets of people. Between whom was this bargain made? He denied that he had been a party to any bargain. He had never made a bargain with hon. Gentlemen opposite, or with hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, with Nonconformists, with Catholics, or with any one. He had endeavoured to the best of his ability, on behalf of his colleagues, to pilot through the House an Education Bill—not a commercial transaction, but a Bill designed, he hoped successfully, to promote the great cause of education. It was not a Bill which embodied, or professed to embody, a bargain between the Government or the House and any denomination, it was a method, which they thought honourable and just, and, he hoped, not ungenerous, of dealing with the educational problem as it presented itself to them, with all the complications and difficulties incident to the long and changing history of education in this country. What was the complaint made against them in this particular instance? He would not enter into the controversy between his hon. friend the Member for Salford and the hon. Member for North Camberwell. He hoped the hon. Member for North Camberwell was right in thinking that the burden on the voluntary schools of Salford of carrying out repairs under the Bill would be small. But the controversy was not relevant to the present issue, which was whether, if the local authority permitted fees to be charged, the product of those fees should be divided between the managers of the schools and the local authority. That seemed to him to be an eminently fair arrangement, whether it was easy or difficult for the managers to carry out the repairs required of them by this Bill. It was not as if they were leaving to the managers the power of charging fees, whether the local authority liked it or not. The local authority was absolutely master of the situation — [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] — they could make every school in their area a free school if they liked, but if they permitted fees to be charged, as in many cases he hoped they would, it was proposed that the product of those fees should be divided between themselves and the managers. He could not understand what there was intrinsically unjust in that proposal, or what foundation it gave to the charge that the Government were departing from an imaginary bargain. The hon. Gentleman said that the Prime Minister, at an earlier stage in the debate, promised that he would introduce a provision that the produce of the fees should be handed over to the local authority. He said that that promise had been broken in spirit, that if fees were charged the whole product should be given to the local authority and should not be shared by anyone else. What shadow of ground was there for the very serious charge which the hon. Gentleman—in all good faith—had brought against His Majesty's Government? Surely a more baseless accusation of breach of faith had never been hurled, to use the hon. Gentleman's own expression, across the floor of the House, for that was not the hon. Gentleman's general method. What more shadowy ground could there be for any accusation of this rather serious kind brought against a responsible Government? The Government had given a promise which was carried out to the letter. He thought it would be felt, and he hoped it would be felt, by the hon. Gentleman who, not in the heat but in the rapidity of debate, had repeated the charge, that there was no foundation for that charge. He hoped that even the Member for North Camberwell in his righteous wrath would not do anything to render the task of voluntary managers more difficult.

DR. MACNAMARA: I am one of them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wondered if the hon. Member had an endowment in a teacher's house and a long list of others. He had no doubt the hon. Gentleman enjoyed them to the full, and he was sure the hon. Member would not refuse to others, including his hon. friend on the Ministerial side of the House, the advantages which he himself enjoyed.

MR. WHITLEY said he wished to say a few words in reply to the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had left out of the account one item, which showed that this was an indirect way of enabling the managers to claim a rent for their premises. The right hon. Gentleman laid stress on the fact that the local authority might, if they thought fit, charge fees, and he led the Committee to understand that the local authority would be a free agent in the matter. Certainly, he maintained that the local authority was not a free agent, because the managers would say, "We will only allow our schools to be open if you permit us to charge fees;" and then with that they would claim half the fees and appeal to the Board of Education. He contended that he had proved his case.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said that they had to thank the Prime Minister for a phrase which would become historic in connection with this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he was not conducting a commercial transaction, but carrying an Education Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Trying to.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT: Trying to do it with the aid of the Closure and the guillotine, and not introducing the Clauses to which they objected until after he had imposed his guillotine. He would illustrate to the Prime Minister his point from a commercial transaction in a business notoriously the lowest in this country. It was a case which actually happened in a horse transaction. A man rode up on a very high-spirited, clever horse, and offered to sell it to a man who wanted to buy it. They arranged that the price should be, say, £100. The man who was sitting on the horse said to the man on the ground, "You agree to give me £100 for the horse?" The man on the ground replied "I agree." Then the man on the horse said, "What are you going to give me for the bridle?" The man on the ground said, "When I bought the horse I thought I bought it with the bridle too." "Oh, no," said the man on the horse, "if you take the horse without the bridle you can catch it if you can." The two then settled the price for the bridle. Then the man on the horse said, "What are you going to give me for the saddle?" And so there was another deal for the saddle. That was the way in which horse transactions were conducted, and that was the way the Government had conducted these transactions about this Bill. [Some MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] He was very glad to hear the interruption. It showed that the Church which ocularly had throughout these debates been sitting behind the Government, had carried into this matter the spirit of men who dealt in horses. The Prime Minister asked for proof of the bargain. Well, the original draft of the Bill, Clause 8, sub-Section (*d*), said—

> "The managers of the school shall, out of funds provided by them, keep the school house in good repair, and make such alterations and improvements in the buildings as may be reasonably required by the local authority."

Was there any man in or outside that House who did not understand these words to mean that the managers themselves were to be the people to provide these funds? But when that Clause passed, what happened? First of all they had an obligatory arrangement about the rent for teachers' houses. Then there was the arrangement by which the Endowments in the parishes were taken for the benefit of the voluntary schools, and then they had this last arrangement to provide money for the managers, which, according to Clause 8, they were to provide for themselves. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education repudiated that bargain.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The existence of a bargain.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT: Well, the hon. Baronet repudiated the idea of a bargain; he repudiated the idea of terms; he said nothing of the kind ever happened. The Prime Minister said the Government were trying to pass an Education Bill, not conducting a commercial transaction. But on 29th October the Attorney General said that—

> "So far as repairs were concerned, the managers would keep the schools in a condition fit for educational purposes."

The right hon. Member for Oxford University thereupon wanted to know 'what the bargain was." Why, the right hon. Gentleman was the man who first negotiated the bargain!

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): The hon. Gentleman should give some proof of that statement. I negotiated no bargain. If I had negotiated the so-called bargain I should have tried to make a better one.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would not mind saying whether he was present at Convocation when the terms of the bargain were discussed?

MR. TALBOT said he thought the hon. Gentleman ought to have known that he had not the honour to be a Member of Convocation. [OPPOSITION cries of " His brother."]

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said he had thought the right hon. Gentleman was one of the persons who conducted the initial stages of the bargain. He now found he was wrong. It was not the right hon. Gentleman, but his brother; and he would be the last person to hold a man responsible for what his brother did. Then the quotation went on—

> "Mr. Talbot wanted to know what the bargain was. What he understood was that the fabric and its repairs were to be maintained by the owners, and that all else would be put on the local authority. That, however, was now to be pressed further. He was not saying he objected to that, or that it was an unfair bargain; but he wanted to know what the bargain really was."

He thought no one but the Prime Minister, who had told them that in such matters he was a perfect child, would say that there was no arrangement or understanding or proposal, made on one side and accepted on the other, between the Church and the Government as to the terms on which the voluntary schools were to be transferred to the rates. What justified the indignation expressed on that side of the House was not merely that there had been such an arrangement, but that, by those suddenly revealed new proposals, it was being departed from; and that denominational schools were now being put into a position which would enable them to receive contributions, not only from the rates, but also from rents and endowments and fees, and get everything they wanted without having to pay a single penny.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said he thought that, in the interests of fair debate, the hon. Gentleman should either justify or withdraw his statement. He said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University was a party to a bargain. The right hon. Gentleman denied that, and it was also repudiated by right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. He thought it was a most unfair observation.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said he did not desire to do anything unfair; but he felt that, when they appealed to their constituents, who would look at the issue from a clearer point of view, they would be able to bring home every one of the charges they were now making. He admitted he made a mistake as to a name; but his assertion was that the main terms now contained in the Bill were the terms discussed and settled in Convocation, months before the Bill was produced.

DR. MACNAMARA said that when, earlier in the debate, he referred to the expenditure for fuel, light, cleaning and repairs of two schools, an hon. Member opposite asked him if they charged any school fees. He was now able to answer the hon. Gentleman. In one school, school fees to the amount of £47 7s. 5d. were received, and in the other, £51 3s. 3d. Therefore, on the most generous estimate, the schools would have twice as much as they required for repairs.

(10.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 182; Noes 85. (Division List No. 565.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Chrisch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Col. Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pemberton, John S. G.
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan. Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Nolfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Toulmin.

(10.14.) Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 196; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 566.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh're
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (M'dd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the Clause which he now moved related to a class of school which ought not to be ignored or left out of the Bill; but which on the other hand ought not to be thrown on the local authority unless the local authority were prepared to adopt them. Some were marine schools, five in number, which had been taken over for the children of parents connected with the Admiralty in various ways, and which had hitherto received the Parliamentary grant. The other classes of schools were orphanages and institutions, in which in certain large towns waifs and strays were collected together in one building, and were looked after by charitable persons. These schools had for many years received a Parliamentary grant; they were useful for charitable purposes, and it was proposed that while they fulfilled the condition of public elementary schools they should continue to receive the Parliamentary grant, unless they were taken over by the local authority. It was not fair, however, to the local authority that children should be collected from various parts of the United Kingdom, and thrown on the rates of a particular local area. Therefore, the Clause proposed that these schools should be recognised as proper recipients of a Parliamentary grant, and that the local authority should have the option of taking them over, if they so pleased. He did not think that there was any ecclesiastical purpose lurking in the Clause. and he hoped the Committee would agree to it.

New Clause—

"The local education authority may maintain under the provisions of this Act, but shall not be required so to maintain, any marine school, or any school which is part of, or is held in the premises of, any institution in which children are boarded, but their refusal to maintain such a school shall not render the school incapable of receiving the Parliamentary grant, nor shall the school, if not so maintained, be subject to the provisions of this Act as to the appointment of managers."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said they on that side objected to the intrusion of these very delicate subjects in the form of new Clauses at the last moment. If these subjects were deserving of special attention they ought to have been dealt with at an earlier period, so that the Committee might have an opportunity of judging as to their real bearing. He noticed an interesting speech by the Bishop of St. Asaph, in which, alluding to the present group of new Clauses, he said that even yet they might hope to have important Amendments, as there was "an institution known as the House of Lords for putting in Amendments at the last moment; and it might be possible to get a friendly line inserted here and there." As far as he had had time to look into the Clause the observations he would make about it were, that as far as the marine schools were concerned, there were several Departments of the State concerned in their management, and they were under special and exceptional legislation, so that this Clause was not needed in their behoof. As to the other schools, the overwhelming majority were schools which had only been held to be public elementary schools within the last two or three years. There was nothing of a public elementary school character about them, and they were not schools which any ordinary man would believe were public elementary schools unless he was assured they were. The whole theory of a public elementary school was that it should be available to the public in its neighbourhood. Some of the schools referred to in the Clause were in theory open to the public, but in practice they were not. They were not always full, and the vacant places were not filled by children in the locality. People were not aware that they were public elementary schools; and in one or two cases where a claim for admission was made it was received with horror. Some of them had enormous endowments, such as the school of the Royal Hospital at Greenwich. which was endowed to the extent of nearly £7,000 a year. Some were semi-industrial schools, with laundries attached, from which large profits were made. Among the schools which would come under the Clause were the St. Joseph's Home at Sheffield, Princess Louise's Home at Kingston, the School of Handicrafts at Chertsey, the School of the Sacred Heart at Roehampton, the School of the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick, the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum, and a boarding school at Ealing. All these were schools which any man would not assume to be public elementary schools; and if they were to receive grants from the State, they ought to be under local control. They ought not to be withdrawn from the knowledge of the local education authority, which would not interfere with them unduly, where they were properly carried on.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be strongly in favour of the Clause. He could assure him that the Clause had been introduced for no other reason than to protect the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman said, truly enough, that no one in the districts in which they were supposed that they were public elementary schools. They had not the ordinary characteristics of a public elementary school, and their nearest neighbours were not aware that they came under the legal definition of a public elementary school. The Government thought it was extremely hard to saddle the local education authority with the necessity of maintaining those schools. If they wished to do so, well and good; but if they did not desire to do so, why should the burden be thrown upon the local education authority of maintaining children who were gathered from outside their area? If the children were drawn entirely from within the area, there would be no particular hardship in requiring the local authority to maintain the schools; but he thought it would be hard to impose a burden on the rates of any particular county in respect of children drawn from various counties. The complaint was made that the Government had not included the Clause originally in the Bill. The number of such schools was not very large, and their case had not been brought under the notice of the Government until late in the discussions, when they framed the Clause solely in the interest of the local education authority. It did not affect the framework of the Bill in the least. If the Committee chose to throw upon the local education authority the additional burden of maintaining schools in which children were gathered from outside districts, it would not touch sectarian interests in which any one was concerned; but in the view of the Government it would inflict a grave injustice on the local education authority, and for that reason he hoped the Committee would add the Clause to the Bill.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said he thought it was to be regretted that the Committee did not know earlier what was the intention of the Government in regard to these institutions. He quite sympathised with the reason given by the right hon. Gentleman, but, at the same time, they could not help commiserating with themselves, as if they had had notice, they might have been able to lay arguments and facts on the subject before the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman said it was the desire of the Government to protect the local authority; but who would protect the poor children in these institutions? He should like to know whether these schools were public elementary schools or not. If they were, why should they be given differential treatment? The point he felt most keenly was that all these religious institutions were given differential treatment from other cases. That seemed to be the settled policy of he Government, and he regarded it as most unfortunate that such a provision should have found its way into the Bill without the Committee having full opportunity of considering it.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the schools were public elementary schools. They had a Conscience Clause, and the schools were subject to Government inspection. The real reason why the Clause had been framed was, as the Prime Minister had stated, that the children in the schools were brought together from outside districts, and that it would be unfair to throw the burden of supporting these schools on the local education authority without giving them an option in the matter. There was really nothing behind the Clause.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that the management of those schools was often of a most slip-shod character. Many of them also were actually making very considerable profits by means of the Parliamentary grant, as the cost of carrying on charity schools was much less than in the case of ordinary schools, and he thought these were reasons why there should be some representative of the public to see that the money was used for the purpose for which it was granted.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said it was undoubtedly the case that the accounts of some of these schools showed that enormous profits were being made out of the labour in the laundries of the children supposed to be attending these public elementary schools. He thought it was a mistake that many of these schools should be treated as public elementary schools at all. Just as the Code prevented such schools being so treated when conducted for private profit, so it might be worded to prevent many of these schools being held to be public elementary schools, and then they would not come on the funds of the local authority, but that they could satisfactorily be dealt with outside the scope of this Bill he entirely denied, and he complained that the Committee had not had proper time to consider the matter with a view to introducing Amendments to protect the public interest. He further asked whether the words "Parliamentary grant" were carefully defined, so as to show that it was the old grant, and not the grant as it would be under the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was the existing Parliamentary grant.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS moved to insert after the word "maintain" in the first line of the Clause the words "as a public elementary school." He said the object was to make it clear that the Clause should not apply to secondary boarding schools.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, after 'maintain' insert 'as a public elementary school.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Amendment agreed to.

(10.56.) Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 228; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 567.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc,
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, William F (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H. (Sheffi'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Iverness-sh.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tenannt, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Alfred Hutton.

It being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on another Government New Clause, on Schedules and Government New Schedules, and on other proceedings necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion.

New Clause (Application of Act to Scilly Islands)—*(Sir William Anson)*—added to the Bill.

Schedules 1 and 3 disagreed to.

Schedule 4 amended.

(11.13.) Question put, "That this Schedule, as amended, be the Fourth Schedule to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 230; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 568.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. ThomasH. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, CharlesEdw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (CityofLond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, DavidJ (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlingt'n
Peel, HnWm. RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.

Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox. Univ.)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Wm. M'Arthur.

New Schedule (Provision as to Education Committees and Managers.)—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.26.) Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the First Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 225; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 569.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Ld. Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Fredrick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. H A G (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. Cumb. (Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson.
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn, E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph Barnsley
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W, R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur

New Schedule (Provisions as to Transfer of Property and Officers, and Adjustment).—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.38.) Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the Second Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 217; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 570.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Faber,Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHonSir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hn.H.A.G(City of Lond.
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,HnG.R.C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir.EW(B'rySEdm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton,RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton

Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F (Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel,CaptainHerbertMerton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon,Hon.Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHonWalter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney,RtHn W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir FrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt.Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt HnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Peel,Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-ColA.C.E(Taunton
Whiteley,H.(Asht'n-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES — Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard

Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown,GeorgeM. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight

Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

New Schedule (Modification of Acts).—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.48.) Question put, "That this Schedule be added to the Bill as the Third Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 214; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 571.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford Lord Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick, N. S
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir. Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford

Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph Barnsley
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, SirJ. T (Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(12.1.) Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 512.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, RtHn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J G (Oxford Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. M'Kenna.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303.]

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 21st November, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1887.

Two Orders in Council, dated 17th November, 1902, giving effect to Rules of Court; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

University Court Ordinance No. VI. (Glasgow, No. 2). Regulations for Degrees in Science in Public Health; laid before the House yesterday, and to be printed. (No. 189.)

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21st November 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from Luddenham Foot, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Chipping Wycombe, and Oldham; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Dendron; Newbury; and Luddenham Foot; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Toxteth Park; Kirby; and Burscough Bridge; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (BILLS IN PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Petition from Westminster, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition from Luddenham Foot, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions from Ormskirk, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY AND HARBOUR GUARANTEES (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th August; *Mr. Thomas O'Donnell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 376.]

PARLIAMENT (DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th November; *Mr. Hayes-Fisher*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 377.]

COLONIES (GENERAL).

Copy presented, of Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, relative to the Parliamentary and Muncipal and Local Representation of Trading Companies in the Colonies under responsible Government, and the Reply of the Commonwealth of Australia thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 378.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Meteorological Grant Committee.

SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state what progress has been made in the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the subject of the meteorological grant.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am not yet in a position to announce the names of the Committee who will consider the question of the administration of the grant to the Meteorological Society; but some progress has been made with the selection of the Committee, and I hope at no distant date to be able to make a statement on the subject.

Newton Abbot Postmen's Wages.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devonshire, Ashburton): To ask the Postmaster General why there are four different scales of pay in the Newton Abbot post office, although all the postmen are doing similar work; and whether, seeing that the cost of living is the same in that town as in the neighbouring towns of Teignmouth and Torquay, and in some respects higher, he will consider the desirability of according to the postmen of these three towns the same maximum of 24s. per week.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The town postmen at Newton Abbot were formerly on too high a scale. The wages were accordingly reduced some years ago, but the postmen then in the service were allowed to retain their old scale so long as they remain, and the new scale was applied to postmen who entered the service subsequently. This will account for there being temporarily two scales for town postmen at Newton Abbot. The rural postmen are, as is usual, upon a separate scale of wages; but I am not aware of any fourth scale, unless the payments to auxiliary postmen, which are at a lower rate, are referred to. It is not considered that there are sufficient grounds for placing the Newton Abbot postmen upon the same scale as those at seaside towns of summer resort like Torquay and Teignmouth.

Great Western Railway—Accident near Cardiff, 14th November.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembroke): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has caused inquiry to be made into the accident on the Great Western Railway, near Cardiff, on 14th November, in which several persons were injured; and what Report, if any, he has received as to the cause of this accident.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Yes; under an Order of the Board of Trade, inquiry into this accident is being held by an Inspecting Officer of Railways. His Report has not yet been made, but as soon as it has been printed for issue I shall be happy to send the hon. Member a copy.

Naval Ordnance Depôts Staff.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the Sub-Committee, who have visited the ports in order to inquire into the question of the staff at the out-ports, with reference to filling up vacancies in the Naval Ordnance Store Department by the appointment of Naval Warrant Officers, have finished their investigations; and, if so, will he communicate to the House the nature of their Report.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The constitution of the clerical staff at the Royal Naval Ordnance Depôts has now been dealt with by the Sub-Committee referred to, but that of the storehouse and workshop staff at these depôts is still under consideration, and I am unable at the present time to add anything to my previous replies on this subject.

East India Railway—German Locomotives.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that out of the forty engines placed in Germany by the East India Railway Company, and which were all due to be delivered by August last, only one engine and two tenders have been shipped; and does the India Office intend to ask the East India Railway Company to impose the penalties prescribed in the contract.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I am not aware of the facts stated in the Question. As regards the imposition of penalties, that is a matter which must be left to the discretion of the East India Railway Company.

Indian Opium Revenue.

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the average net opium revenue of the last three years.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The average opium revenue for the last three years is £3,075,084.

South Africa—Martial Law—Advertising Account of the "Het Oosten."

MR. HENRY J. WILSON: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that in the early part of the year 1901, Lieutenant Keeton advertised notices and regulations under martial law in a paper called *Het Oosten*, published at Somerset East by Mr. J. A. Vosloo, the account for which amounted to £56 5s. 9d.; that in March, 1902, Mr. Vosloo complained to the War Office of non-payment of this account; and that on or before the 25th of June, 1902, Sir H. Settle reported that he had directed the sum of £56 5s. to be paid to Mr. Vosloo; and if he will state why this account for advertising had not been paid up to the 17th October, 1902, being at that time one year and eight months overdue.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am aware that Sir H. Settle reported that he had directed that this account should be paid, but I have no information concerning the delay. I will cause inquiry to be made.

South Africa—Foreign Subscriptions for Relief of Concentration Camps.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that Holland alone subscribed during the late war 1,325,510,04½ florins for the relief of Boer women and children, of which amount 498,161,04½ florins were sent to South Africa either in money or goods in the later stages of the war, whether in estimating the contributions made by foreign subscribers for the relief of the concentration camps at £562 and 2,646 packages, this was at the rate of exchange of 12 florins and a trifle to the pound sterling; and whether, if this was the rate, he can explain what became of the rest of the money and goods sent to South Africa by Holland and other foreign countries, and into whose hands it fell.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The figures of £562 and 2,646 give the information at our disposal as to foreign contributions expended in concentration camps in the Transvaal. I have no information on the figures given in the question.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order read, for Adjourned Debate on Question [10th November], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts." — (*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Question again proposed.

*(12.5.) MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): —In resuming the debate on the Indian Budget, may I say that it was only a sense of duty which impelled me to move the adjournment of the debate on the last occasion. The Prime Minister and the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, taking into account the great importance of the many interests connected with our vast Indian Empire, and possibly influenced by the fact that many Members connected with India had not obtained an opportunity of expressing their views, have arranged to give a second day for the discussion, and for that I wish to convey to them the grateful thanks of all who are interested in Indian affairs. The Motion of which I have given notice is—

> "To call attention to the Report of the Famine Commission of 1901, and to move—'That the Indian Government be encouraged to act immediately on its recommendations, especially those referring to an increase of the means of irrigation; and to make it a special instruction to the Commission now dealing with this subject, that it should thoroughly investigate the question of irrigation works for some part of India, on a scale similar to that of the recently-constructed works in the Nile Valley.'"

I wish in the first place to express my appreciation of the lucid manner in which the Secretary for India placed his Budget Statement before us. It was a model of concise information. I wish also to congratulate the Under Secretary on the ability which he has shown in dealing with a minor subject—a good augury, I think, for the manner in which he will be able to deal with more important topics when they come under his care. Before taking up the more important topic I wish to deal with another point. In the general discussion on India reference has been made to the depression in the opium industry and in the tea trade. The depression in the latter has, in my opinion, been caused very much by over production, and in a short time will right itself. But no notice has been taken of the still greater depression in indigo, not a very large trade, it is true, the average turnover in normal times being about three millions, but which has now been reduced to less than one-half of that amount owing to the fact that it has to enter into competition with a chemical substitute which has been energetically pushed by the very same Germans who, by the invention of alizarine, swept the madder trade off the face of the earth. It is an interesting study in national economics how these long-haired, short-sighted, spectacled German professors, savouring of midnight oil, have been able to dispossess us of a great deal of trade, both in the East and West Indies. In the case of the West Indies, aided by the bounties, they have done so by reason of the great improvements they have effected in the cultivation of beet sugar, and in the East by the introduction of various dyes they have been able to oust, in a great measure, native dyes. A few years ago the leading director of one of these German firms told me it was one of the principal object of his life to invent and perfect an artificial indigo. His firm has been spending an enormous amount of money on the research and has met with a considerable amount of success. But natural indigo still retained properties which they had not been able to impart to its artificial competitor, and the fact remained that well-grown, carefully manufactured indigo was still able to hold its own. Carelessly-grown and slovenly manufactured indigo—which was the characteristic of the great proportion produced in India—has no chance, and is rapidly being dispossessed from the various markets of Europe. To prevent the extinction of the trade I recommend that the Indian Government should adopt the same system as has been adopted by the German Government in regard to the manufacture of beet sugar—viz., send experts into the indigo districts, and teach the natives how to improve both the cultivation and the method of manufacture. It is nonsense to say that India is too conservative to adapt herself to new ideas, for the people there have shown a marked appreciation of railways and other improvements. They have also displayed considerable aptitude in dealing with artificial dyes and in palming them off on their fellow countrymen.

I now come to the Report of the Famine Commission. The immediate cause of famine in India is the failure of the usual rainfall, which failure occurs at very irregular intervals, and generally lasts for one year, in some cases two years, and in very rare instances, as in the last awful famine, for three years consecutively in some of the districts affected. The Commissioners estimate that drought will come on an average every twelve years. It is one of the inexorable laws of nature with which every Government of India is bound to reckon. But the effects of this great natural cause, which acts inexorably and relentlessly, are very much aggravated by the social and economical condition of the people of India. Their standard of living is wretchedly low. A few handfuls of rice per diem for food, and a slender strip of calico loin cloth for clothing, being deemed by them quite sufficient for their maintenance. Their fecundity is enormous, and keeps them always on the very brink of starvation. In ancient times the drastic remedies of the sword, pestilence and famine did their work remorselessly and without let or hindrance in keeping down the superabundant population, but under the benign influence of British rule, the sword has been sheathed, the ravages of pestilence and famine are more successfully combated and alleviated, and the population has been increasing at an enormous rate. From 1881–91 it increased 33,000,000, an amount equal to the entire population of Britain at the time, and this was an addition to an already densely crowded population.

During this period, and notwithstanding the shorter duration of life in Eastern countries, its population increased by 13 per cent., whilst that of Scotland increased by 7¾ per cent., a rate of increase in India which, if continued, represents the doubling of its population in about sixty years. And at the present time there are now about 1,250 to the square mile of cultivated land, as compared with about 700 in Egypt. With these great natural, economical and social causes before us, it is idle, therefore, for hon. Members to assign as the principal causes any dereliction of duty on the part of the Indian Government in dealing with the land question or any other. A section of the native Press and a few philanthropic, but not well-informed, gentlemen on this side look upon an extravagant civil and military expenditure as the great cause of the poverty of the natives, and others put the Land Revenue Laws in the forefront, but there was more loss to the cultivators, representing only about a fourth of the population of India, by the last famine than the total amount of the yearly expenditure by the Government on all objects put together; and in the Central Provinces the agricultural population lost more by famine in one year than the total Land Revenue for fifty years. I do not think it is fair to the Indian Government to blame it for bad management in connection with the famine, when at its height in 1900, a population of about 85,000,000, of whom half were in the native states, was affected, and the number in the relief works or in receipt of gratuitous relief was considerably over 6,000,000. No other Government in the world had the organisation ready to deal with such a gigantic calamity; and the officials of the Government, many of whom laid down their lives in the work, deserve the highest credit for their unremitting and heroic efforts.

I next come to the remedies for famine recommended in the Report. They are threefold—material, legislative, and moral. Of the moral remedies, the Report naturally does not speak very much, except as advising thrift, etc.; but everything that tends to assist the moral progress of the people of India, that helps their self-control, that promotes their education, raises their standard of living, and improves their economical position, is helping to fight against the evil effects of famine in the future. Of the recommendations of the Commission as to the institution of agricultural banks, reforms in revenue, law and administration, designed to free the cultivators from the clutches of the money-lenders, and Amendments to the famine codes, I thoroughly approve. I approve also of their recommendation, so far as it goes, for a more thorough examination of possible irrigation projects. In the Report, paragraph 351, the Commissioners state as follows—

> "The evidence which we have taken, and our own experience, show that there is a wide field for the construction of irrigation works. All provinces do not present practicable schemes for the construction of great canals, but the possibilities of smaller protective works have in no province been exhausted, while in some provinces they have as yet hardly been examined. For storage tanks, reservoirs, and, above all, irrigation wells, the scope and the necessity are very great."

The Commissioners have done good work in fostering the construction of wells and smaller irrigation works, the appointment of experts to guide the natives in the direction, and with power to sanction the granting of loans for these purposes. But they have done better work when they point to the confirmation which their inquiries afford, to the conclusions of the last Commission, and express their cordial approval of a new departure in famine policy, which would place irrigation works in the place that protective railways have hitherto occupied in the famine insurance programme. This is one of the most noteworthy paragraphs which has ever appeared in any Indian Report. It is an indirect indictment of the former negligence of the Indian Government in regard to irrigation, and of their policy of starving canals in favour of railways. It endorses the two former Commissions in this respect, and I believe it has been the immediate cause of the appointment of a Commission to deal specially with irrigation, and of the increase of a quarter of a crore of rupees to the irrigation protective works fund. Led away by the Report of the Commission on Public Works of 1878, the Indian Government have for many years ignored the Reports of its Famine Commission of 1882, and even of 1898, both of which agree with the present Report on this subject, and initiated the policy of starving irrigation in favour of railways. From 1882 to 1898 the expenditure on railways was £246,609,305, while on canals it was only £39,359,065, and recent policy has been on the same lines, but to double the proportion. This is not in accordance with the policy recommended by this or the two preceding Famine Commissions, and it would be well for the House of Commons to give a decided expression of opinion on this subject.

Besides their great advantages for irrigation, in some cases the canals offer the cheapest and most convenient carriage in the world. The United States and some Continental countries are beginning to wake up to their importance. Irrigation works are, besides, a great protection against floods, much famine having been caused by flood as well as by drought. Calculations showing only financial profit on investment from irrigation sources are quite misleading. Lord Curzon, speaking at Lyalpur of the result of the work on the canal which he had just inspected, says the expenditure of 16 lacs is yielding a return of nearly 7½ per cent. on the money invested, while the total crop in a single year equals the capital cost of the entire works.

For all these reasons, therefore, it would, in my opinion, be good for India that her Government should be encouraged by the House to act immediately on the recommendations of the Famine Commission of 1901, especially those referring to increased means of irrigation. Every Commission yet appointed has put this recommendation in the place of paramount importance. The Indian Government has recently appointed a Commission, under the Chairmanship of Sir Colin Scott Moncrieffe, to take up the subject of irrigation where the Famine Commission left off, but I understand that its scope is limited to minor works. My Motion indicates that it should be a special instruction to this Commission to investigate thoroughly the question of irrigation works for various parts of India on a scale similar to that of the irrigation works recently constructed in the Nile Valley. These immense dams, constructed at a cost of about £3,000,000, are capable of containing over 1,000 million tons of water, which, in the season when it is most required, will flow out in a stream twice as big as that of the Thames as it passes under Westminster Bridge. In making these suggestions I am aware of the magnitude of some of the irrigation works already existing in India, costing, if you include their tributary canals, some of them between two and three millions, and that the great Nile dams have actually been planned and superintended by engineers from India. I am also aware of the great zeal which the present Viceroy and Council have shewn for the promotion of irrigation works: I also concur with what the Secretary for India said when speaking on the subject in February, that those who thought that famine could be banished from all districts of India by irrigation are very much mistaken; but there is no doubt an enormously greater number of districts could be made like Sudh, which, with the lowest rainfall in India, viz., 1·5 inches, completely protects itself against famine by irrigation, and the fact remains that no Government has yet constructed a reservoir of any capacity in India.

I will not detain the House by going into details of this question, but conclude by saying that, as the immediate cause of famine is want of water, so the first and great remedy must be to supply water in time of drought, and as in India there is, speaking generally, and taking one time with another, more than an ample supply, the question resolves itself very much into a problem of engineering, and I cannot help thinking, and I say it deliberately and with a knowledge of the great irrigation works which do exist in India, that this country, which is first amongst the nations for engineering skill and resources, has not sufficiently availed itself of this skill and of these resources. In Egypt, this engineering skill has just now shown magnificent results, and Egypt with her 13,000 square miles of cultivated land and small population of about 9,000,000, has been put into such a splendid position of irrigation supply by the aid of India's engineers that it may well stand out as a brilliant example to many of the districts of India which has a cultivated area 26 times, and a population 33 times, greater. The rainfall is so abundant in some parts of India that as much sometimes falls in one day as during the whole year in some parts of the United Kingdom, and India possesses one of the finest river systems in the world, in many cases fed not only by the great monsoon rains, but also, line the Nile, even in times of fiercest drought, by the eternal snows lying along the southern slopes of the Himalayas, which tower to a loftier height than any other mountain range in the world, and if the Indian Government will undertake colossal irrigation works on a scale like those which have recently been so successfully completed in the Nile Valley, and assiduously promote the minor means of irrigation recommended by the Commission, it will do much to mitigate the periodical visitation of famine in some districts, and in many districts do away with them altogether.

*(12.40) COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): We have listened with interest to what my hon. friend thinks should be the policy of the Government in India in combating the poverty of the country. He recommends the irrigation of India by water. I wish to recommend its irrigation by gold. My hon. friend's policy demands works; my policy requires only faith. My hon. friend asks for the construction of a dam; I ask for the removal of a dam. India is a poor country, and there are many cures for poverty; but they all in the end result in the application of cash. At the present time private capital, which is invested to such an enormous extent over the rest of the civilised world, is practically debarred from entering India. Lord Curzon has spoken about this most seriously: he has entreated British capitalists to put their spare cash into India, but they refuse. And why? Any person can raise a loan, and the noble Lord the Secretary of State can always, if he chooses to pay the rate of interest demanded, raise loans, but these loans will never cure the poverty of India. What is needed in India, is what goes on in every other civilised country, the importation of private capital, taking its own risk and serving the people for what remuneration they are able to give in return. At the present moment India is groaning under the burden of interest, and it is only the firm value of the rupee that enables her to bear it at all. What happens to a private capitalist if he goes to India and offers to erect public works, or in other ways introduce private capital? The following may be taken as a summary of the treatment meted out to him. First of all, you have to find your official. When you do, you find a courteous English gentleman. You will produce to this English gentleman your scheme, involving an expenditure of a million. He receives you politely, but the moment you turn your back he begins to ascertain where you have stolen that million, for it is impossible for him to conceive of any one with honestly found, and therefore hardly earned, money coming to India to worry the Public Works Department, and compete with the Government, and from that time every impediment is placed in your way. That is what restrains people from going to India with money. They are not wanted. Officials have a low opinion of capitalists—not always unjustified—but there is surely no use in slumping all together. That spirit arises from the old principle that used to govern India when John Company ran India, and no opposition to John Company was permitted in India; the idea has not yet been driven out of the heads of Indian officials. Lord Lawrence once said, when asked if private enterprise were not good for India, "I know what private enterprise is; it is robbing the Government." Now, if India is to prosper, this spirit must be got rid of; restrictions must be abolished, the public must be allowed to compete with the gigantic monopolies of the Indian Government. I know of instances where means that no one would dare to adopt in this country have been taken to stop competition. I know of an instance where a bridge was projected across a river so low that no steamers were able to pass below it, and it was only the far-seeing kindness of the Secretary of State and of Lord Curzon that prevented its being thus built. Another grievance of capitalists arises from the short term of official office. There was a case of a tramway which was badly wanted in Assam. A company proposed to the Commissioner to construct it, and the Commissioner wrote a despatch stating that in his opinion it was a necessary work. Then he discovered that his term of office expired in six months, and so he tore up his despatch, and said he could not bind his successor. In a case where it was

proposed to set up electric lighting in one of the great Indian towns, three different and successive sets of experts had to be convinced, beginning *de novo*, before the contract could be settled. Every expert reported in favour of it; but before he retired so arranged matters that he had no responsibility for what happened. Nine years were spent in getting that electric lighting system established. Thus is enterprise discouraged. A private company proposed to establish the electric light at Cawnpore. The City Corporation and Local Government supported the scheme, but the Public Works Department made impossible conditions and brought the negotiations to a standstill. Again, take the extremely unfair discrimination made in regard to the enforcement of the Carriers Act. The Indian railways are exempted from its operation, but private steamboat services and other means of communication are rigidly subjected to it.

You will for these reasons never get private capital into India until the whole administration is changed. The administration is extremely honest, but often rather stupid. Dislike of responsibility is so great that private enterprise is discouraged in the highest possible degree. I am aware that what I have said is known to the noble Lord the Secretary of State and Lord Curzon, and that they have nobly struggled against the system, but no man, however gifted and determined to thrust through improvements, can do so in the short period of time which is given to Indian officials. The system must be taken up by the roots and altered. I was in the City this morning and happened to run across a City financier who could turn gold into India as easily as my hon. friend would turn water into it, and in reply to a question I put to him, he said, "Sir, India and Indian methods stink in the nostrils of the City of London." The noble Lord cannot draw private capital into the country with a loan and a guarantee. What is wanted is inquiry. There are men in the House willing to devote their time to sitting upon a Committee to inquire into the origin, acts, and results of the Indian Public Works Department. Such a Committee the noble Lord should appoint, and the sooner it is appointed the better, if he desires to help our great dependency.

(12.54.) MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): It is a matter of congratulation to hon. Members on both sides of the House that we are able to discuss the Budget this year with the knowledge that the Indian Empire is practically free from famine. During the last two years we have not been in that position. I have had opportunities of visiting the famine-stricken districts; I have witnessed the pitiable condition of the patient and uncomplaining population, and I can testify to the self-sacrificing endeavours of the civil servants to mitigate the famine in every possible way. It must, too, be a matter of rejoicing that the great Durbar will be celebrated when India is practically free from famine and pestilence. There is to be considerable expenditure drawn from the Indian Exchequer in connection with the celebration. That will be largely for the benefit of English visitors, and I cannot help contrasting that fact with the ungracious and mean treatment contemplated towards our Indian guests who came to the Coronation. It is true that the noble Lord made certain statements as to the financial exigencies of this country in connection with the South African war, but has he forgotten that the Welby Commission declared emphatically that more than a quarter of a million sterling had been drawn from the taxpayers of India more than they were justly entitled to pay for years, and that the British Government had not the honesty to make restitution, but merely reduced the charge from the year 1901. This question of the payment of the expenses of our guests is, however, a closed incident, but I hope that such a thing will never occur again.

It is a matter for congratulation, that the Indian Budget for the first time in the history of the association of this country with India, shows a balance of assets over liabilities; and from an examination of the statistics, I believe that the financial position of India is better than it is commonly believed to be in this country. Last year the assets fell short of the liabilities by no less a sum than nine and a half millions sterling, but this year they exceed them by one and a half millions. This is an extraordinary change in the financial situation. The total obligations of India, both in the shape of Funded and Unfunded Debt on the 31st March last, amounted to 226 millions sterling, and the assets to 227½ millions. Included in those assets there is no less a sum than 160 millions sterling invested in State-owned railways, earning an average dividend of 5⅓ per cent. If you capitalise those railways at 3½ per cent. you get a capital value of 247 millions sterling. Then we have included in the liabilities twenty-four millions which has been expended on irrigation works. I agree very largely with the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire as to the value of irrigation works, but I hold that their construction and the making of railways should go on hand in hand. The money spent on the irrigation works last year produced a profit of 7⅓ per cent., and if that were capitalised, we should get an addition of 48 millions to our assets, bringing the total up to 294 millions sterling, or 68 millions surplus over the liabilities. The debt of India is thus much more than covered by revenue-producing assets in the shape of railways and irrigation works owned by the State, and leaving out the posts and telegraphs and, also, the land and forest revenues. I am glad that the British investing public are beginning to realise what good security taking up an Indian railway loan really is. I think the result of the railway and irrigation works already constructed is such as to justify more rapid progress being made in the future with similar undertakings. I do not altogether agree with the views of the hon. and gallant Member who last spoke. I think that the railways in India should belong to the State rather than to private companies. A great mistake was made when the Government of India, having leased important railways to private companies, failed to take advantage of its power to take them over at the end of twenty-five years. When they did eventually take them over, they had to pay an enormous premium, to the permanent detriment of the Indian Exchequer. With regard to the whole of the railways in India, there is the encouraging result that the net average profit upon their working last year was 5⅓ per cent. Whereas those railways showed a deficit of £480,000 ten years ago, last year, in addition to the repayment of £590,000 for redemption, they showed a profit of £817,000. It is satisfactory to notice that sanction has been given for the construction of 2284 more miles of railway, and I hope the policy of the Government in constructing railways will be continued, especially in constructing feeder lines to the great trunk lines. These feeder lines will not only pay in themselves, but will make the trunk lines still more profitable. I am glad to see that a sum of £8,000,000 has been allocated by the Government and private companies for the construction of railways during the ensuing year. That is a fact upon which the Government of India are to be congratulated.

Before leaving the question of finance, I wish to draw attention to the complicated nature of the accounts. I find on going through the Financial Statement upon which the Budget of India is based that it is extremely difficult to discover, with regard to revenue-producing works, how much money is borrowed and how much comes out of the revenue for the year. It is highly desirable that the accounts of these revenue-producing works should be kept entirely separate from the civil and military charges.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): So they are.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: The accounts are kept in such a form that it is very difficult, at any rate for me, to ascertain clearly the respective results of each class of undertaking. Although in many districts the people of India are extremely poverty-stricken, the financial results of the last three years have been most surprising. I think, in view of the fact that when in 1888 the salt tax was raised it was clearly understood that the increase was to be regarded as only temporary, an early opportunity should now be taken to reduce it. I am glad to see that the Indian Government has remitted one million and a quarter of rent to the land cultivators. But that remission will not benefit the cultivators to the same extent as a reduction of the salt tax would have done, and it is extremely desirable that the salt tax should be reduced at the earliest possible moment. It must be remembered that, after all, a remission of rent only increases the security of the money lender. Still, as £16,000,000 has been spent by the Government on the relief of the famine, and as that amount represents nearly the whole of the yield of the salt tax for three years, I am bound to admit that the tax is largely used for the relief of the famine-stricken natives.

It was a source of great satisfaction to me to hear the statement made by the Secretary for India in the House last Monday with respect to our position and influence in Afghanistan, especially as we are incurring enormous expenditure on our North-West frontier in a military sense, and have also spent large sums in Afghanistan in order to keep our influence predominant there. I do not know how much truth there is in the rumour that Russia is endeavouring to acquire a closer association with the Court of the Ameer by having a commercial representative there, but if the rumour is true it may be taken for granted that political influence will also be exercised by the Russian representative, because it is absolutely impossible to separate political influence from commercial influence. Commercial influence would be the thin end of the wedge, and would be sure to lead to complications. I hope, therefore, that the House will receive an assurance from the noble Lord the Secretary for India, that the arrangements between this country and the Ameer and the Russian Government are in no danger of being upset.

Then there is the question of promoting trade between India and Persia. I think the Government are to be congratulated on having taken in hand the Quetta-Nushki railway and have opened up caravan routes from Baluchistan to Seistan and other regions of Persia. The trade has developed enormously, but I should be glad to hear that certain hindrances to it had been removed. I refer more especially to the interference of Russian medical officers on the ground of the possible importation of plague—an interference which is seriously hampering the development of trade with Persia. I think that the Government of India, as the trustees of the people of India, have an enormous responsibility resting upon them of using all their influence to carry out the settled policy of the country in preserving the integrity of Persia.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I do not see how the question of the relations between this country and Persia arises on the Indian Budget. That is surely a matter rather for the Foreign Office.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: I do not want to transgress, but I think you will see that I am in order, inasmuch as there is included in the Indian Budget a sum for what is called the Persian Mission, and I desire information about it.

*Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: There is no Mission.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: A sum of £6,000 is given in the Budget for the Persian Mission. Then there is also the question of the India-European-Persia telegraph line. A sum of £232,500 has already been spent upon the line, and the present Budget provides for a further expenditure with respect to it of £87,000. This telegraph line is really the main line of communication between this country and India, and, if I am not out of order, I desire to urge that no portion of the line should cross through Russia, as in case of any disagreement with that country the line would be liable to be cut. I would also urge that it is highly desirable, in the interests of the proper protection of the line, as well as of our commercial interests, that a road should be constructed from Bander Abbas to Ispahan, which would enable the more rapid repair of the line should it break down at any time. I should like to point out that any disturbance of the *status quo* in Persia would seriously endanger our Indian Empire.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in dealing with that point.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: Very well, Sir. I understand that the Persian Mission has been sent by India to Persia in order to uphold British interests in Persia.

*The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): What does the hon. Gentleman mean by the Mission to Persia? Does he refer to the Consular service?

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I am referring to the item of £6,000 for what is called the Persian Mission, and should like some information as to how the money has been spent.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: For Consular services.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: As the salary of the political officer in charge of the Mission appears on the Budget, I think I am in order in referring to it.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member would be out of order in going into the question of the relations of this country with Persia and of maintaining the *status quo.* That is a matter quite outside the region of Consular officers.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I only want to impress on the Government the fact that any alteration of the *status quo* in Persia would seriously endanger the safety of India, and I want them to use all the means in their power to prevent any such thing happening.

(1.25.) SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down referred to the extraordinarily high level at which the salt tax is maintained, and the state of stagnation of that revenue appears to give a very strong confirmation to his view. I think that we in this House have reason to feel uneasy at that state of things which appears to argue that less salt is consumed by the poorer people than is consistent with a wholesome condition of life. It is to be hoped that the Government of India will be able to recur to the former low level of tax in the best interests of the community. Then he referred with some misgiving to the fact that money was being spent upon the Indo-European telegraph line. The hon. Member omitted from his consideration the fact that we have already a direct cable to India, but even that is not sufficient, and I would ask my noble friend the Secretary of State for India whether any steps have been taken to connect Keeling Islands, by means of a spur cable, with Ceylon. I need hardly impress upon the noble Lord the advisability of getting that done, because it would afford us a duplicate cable to India by way of Vancouver, Australia, Keeling, and Ceylon, and thence on to India. I have already mentioned the matter to the Colonial Secretary, under whose jurisdiction Keeling is, and he promised to see to it at the earliest possible opportunity. My hon. friend the Member for Dumbartonshire has very pointedly drawn the attention of the House to the shortcomings of successive Indian administrators, to the absence of large and comprehensive schemes of irrigation. I can endorse a good deal of what he said, while not being able to blame the Indian Government. After all, they, like any ordinary individual, have to cut their coat according to their cloth, and I am not sure that they have not exercised a wise and salutary discretion in disposing of their limited financial resources by encouraging the construction and promotion of branch railways, so that wheat and grain from districts where there is a plethora of them may be transported into other districts where there may be a scarcity. At the same time, I am far from wishing to throw cold water upon the views and arguments advanced with so much ability by my hon. friend, and I would fain hope and believe that the Government may soon be in a position to undertake and to establish schemes of irrigation which would tap large sources of supply, such as those afforded by the mighty rivers there, and so bring large tracts of land under cultivation.

I now desire to associate myself, though in a guarded way, with the congratulations tendered to my noble friend on the Statement presented to the House. Substantially it exhibits on the surface, at any rate, a progressive and a prosperous development of the financial and economic position. The elasticity displayed by the various branches of revenue is certainly remarkable, but one is naturally led to enquire in estimating whether there has been an improvement or a relative set-back, whether these sources of revenue are sources to which the ryots and the masses of the agricultural population to any extent contribute. That is one point. The other is whether the general expansion of activity is co-extensive with and at all proportionate to the increase of the population, which, in spite of famine, has undoubtedly taken place in the last two decades. The House will remember that within that period the whole of the province of Upper Burma, with its eighty odd thousand square miles and three to four millions of inhabitants, has been incorporated with British India. What are the sources of income which have increased in bulk and in volume? My noble friend tells us that they are from imports, such as cotton goods and beet sugar, which the proletariat certainly do not use, and again from such heads as post office, stamps, excise, and income tax. Sir, the increase in stamps is held to be a sign of greater combativeness and a litigious spirit, and as regards excise, the debate has shown that in spite of the determination of the Government to discourage the provision of facilities for drink, drunkenness is not on the decrease, and therefore an addition to that head of revenue can be no matter for gratification. What I mean to say is that these are not categories of State income obtained from the poorer people, and I submit that they can scarcely be considered as affording any reliable evidence of a widespread increment of the margin of prosperity and purchasing power. My noble friend has told us of the rate at which surpluses have accumulated. I beg leave to examine and to dissect analytically the conclusions he so readily draws, or which seem to be so glibly drawn, as to the people's well-being, and when my noble friend assures the House on the warrant of the expansion of the revenue shown by the last two accounts that this is the case, I feel bound to part company with him.

After the choruses and pæans of rejoicing shown indifferently on these and on the Benches opposite, I rather feel like a skeleton at the feast. What are, broadly, the factors, the co-efficients of a country's progress? In a country like India, I would say the state of the export trade, the condition of the manufacturing industry and of the railways, would be the best criteria to guide one's opinion. Now as regards the export trade, we are told that it has increased by 16 per cent. True, but that increase is shown on a comparison with the exports in years of famine, and after two or three years of enforced rest the soil is bound to show its recuperative power, and I therefore question whether that increase is quite as satisfactory as under former currency conditions it might reasonably have been expected to be. It is also true that railway receipts have improved, but let us remember that even during the last year the effects of famine had not altogether disappeared, and I do not know to what extent these receipts may have been affected by the transport of men and of grain in connection with famine relief, and therefore paid for by the State. And when we come to the state of manufactures, it indicates a high-water mark of stagnation, if not of decadence and retrogression, and so one feels impelled to ask whether these surpluses have not been derived at the cost of numerically and economically two of the most important classes of the community, by the insidious operation of currency changes. The staple manufacture in Bombay consists of cotton goods. I refer principally to that presidency because I happen to know something of it, but I am assured that my remarks equally apply to kindred industries in other parts of India. In Bombay no less than fifteen to twenty crores of rupees have been invested in cotton mills. Out of the sixty that were flourishing before the closing of the mints, no less than fifteen are now eking out a precarious existence and ten others are utterly unable to cope with the critical conditions which now confront them. Sir, I have the authority of a native gentleman, whose expert knowledge of the subject my noble friend will not deny—I mean Mr. Tata—who says that "market values declined even in '95 below the point reached in '90, that in nearly every case the value of 1900 is much lower than that of '90 and '95, and lower than the par value."

So much for the textile industry. If the House turns its attention to the tea, coffee and indigo enterprises, it will find that they experience the greatest difficulty in maintaining the competition against the products of similar industries coming to Europe from silver standard countries. Does my noble friend think it so inconceivable that the disturbance of values, necessarily of a far-reaching character, brought about by the alteration of the standard and the closing of the mints to the free coinage of silver, may have exercised a powerful influence in contributing to these untoward and prejudicial results? I am told that other causes have been at work, extraneous, alien, and beyond the will or the ordering of the Indian Government, and that these are substantial factors in the phenomena which I am endeavouring to submit to the judgment of the House. Well, granted that, I ask how are we representatives of the highest tribunal, to which are committed the interests and the welfare in the last resort of those hundreds of millions of poverty-stricken peasants? We are, according to the felicitous phrase of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, each of us a "Member for India," who owe it to our consciences, as my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean says,—

> "To see that these millions do not suffer from the misplaced and ill-judged administrative initiative of the Indian Government."

How are we, without the facts and the data and the testimony of those who suffer, to discriminate between those elements in the economic situation which Government is capable of redressing or largely mitigating, and those other elements which, resulting from causes outside the purview of their control, must consequently be beyond their power to affect? With all due deference, I submit to my noble friend whether it is not a reasonable proposition, when an issue of such gigantic magnitude is weighing in the balance, when the origin of that issue is apparently connected with and has become progressively acute since the inauguration of those currency laws with which the House is familiar, that some kind of serious and searching inquiry, not necessarily a public inquiry —I should rather say that inquiry by Government officials in India should be instituted—to ascertain, as far as may be, the subtle play of the economic forces which you have created, and so endeavour to reach a solution of the problem in the interests of the teeming, toiling masses of the community. That was a stupendous change. It was, after all is said and done, decided upon under the spur and stress of a difficult and an increasingly awkward Budget situation. Sir, that situation cannot be held solely to be a justification to that step, irrespective of its effect upon the wealth-producing members, however that situation has undoubtedly been relieved, but whether relief has or has not been procured at the cost of transferring the burden from the shoulders of classes, I mean those who have to send money home and those who use articles and luxuries of European origin —as the House will see, a relatively insignificant class—on to the shoulders of another, by far the most important, and from their helpless and uncomplaining nature the class that compels the consideration and commiseration of this House—I mean, of course, the agricultural people. My noble friend brushed aside, with perfect courtesy, but with an easy nonchalance, the whole matter by informing me that the Commission of 1899 had disposed of the whole thing, and that there is nothing in the allegations to invalidate its finding. That was a question-begging reply, as I hope to show presently. He entirely missed the gist of the point of the case. The Commission presided over by the right hon. Gentleman opposite commenced its labours in May, 1898. I beg to ask the attention of the House particularly to this point. The rupee had then barely attained the steady equilibrium of sixteen pence, because it was only in May, 1898, curiously enough, that it touched the magic figure, and beyond infinitesimal oscillations has remained there ever since. My noble friend will see that the economic disturbance and transference of the incidence of the burdens, if such things have taken place, consequent upon the diversion of the rupee from the intrinsic value of silver, had not had sufficient time to operate. I think hon. Members will acquiesce in the contention that that Commission investigated a state of things against which we have no complaint to make, and not the fixed sixteen penny rate which, since its

Report, has been crystallized as a permanent factor. What is it that in the main has enabled the rupee to be screwed up to, and to be maintained at a parity of forty-two pence per ounce, when the metal of which it is composed has gradually dwindled, until it has now reached the abnormally and unprecedentedly low price of not much more than twenty-two pence by manipulation and contraction of the currency? That is incontestable—at any rate I have not seen it successfully disputed. The policy was admittedly and avowedly a tentative policy. The Indian Government categorically refused to name a minimum for the sale of their drafts, which it shows that in their view it was in the nature of an experiment. It would seem that now, after the lapse of four years, during which equilibrium in exchange has been secured, it is reasonable to ask that some review of its action and its effect upon Indian commerce, trade and industry, should be undertaken. India is a poor country, and the gold standard suddenly introduced there cannot have been without its effect upon interests which have from time immemorial been based upon a totally different standard. The employment of gold enters infinitesimally, if it enters at all, into the daily transactions, consequently the restriction of the coinage, and during the last eight years something like five and a half to six crores less has been coined than would have been coined judging from the average of former years, and not allowing for any expansion of the people's needs, tends, and must from the nature of the case tend, to produce periodic disturbance in the money market and harassment to the multiplicity of business transactions.

We see this curious phenomenon, that while the rupee has been artificially increased in value, it has to-day scarcely any greater purchasing power in India than it had before the mints were closed. On the other hand, let me very briefly illustrate what has occurred. The exporter in India sells his produce, say wheat, at forty shillings a quarter in England; as a matter of fact it is rather less, but that does not affect the argument. For these forty shillings he gets about 40 per cent. less in rupees, so that he is mulcted to that extent. He is obliged to part with a larger percentage of produce, while the weight of taxation remains the same. There is no point in the argument that he should hold out for a higher gold price, and for this reason, that the price of a commodity is ultimately determined and governed by the cost of its production at the largest sources of supply and centres of production and distribution, so that while American and Australian and Russian cereals are selling at a certain level of price, Indian wheat must obviously adapt itself and conform to that level. If the House desires an authoritative confirmation of what I am advancing, I beg leave to read a very short extract from a letter of the Treasury to the Secretary of State for India, bearing date 24th November, 1879. Referring to the proposal of the Indian Government to restrict the coinage of rupees—

Sir Edward Sassoon.

> "My Lords say in general the object of those Governments who embark on that course is to diminish the amount they have to pay to their creditors. In the present case, the object of the Indian Government appears to be to increase the amount they have to exact from the taxpayers. My Lords fail to see any real difference in the character of the two transactions. If the present level of exchange be due to the depression of silver, the Government scheme if it succeeds may relieve the Indian Government and others who desire to remit money to England. But this relief will be again at the expense of the Indian taxpayer, and with the effect of increasing every debt or fixed payment in India, including debts due by ryots to moneylenders."

Then again the Indian Government, writing to the Secretary of State in 1886, freely admits that

> "So far from the value in exchange having proved injurious to the people of India, the Indian cultivator appears to have actually gained."

I feel sure the noble Lord would be the last person to dispute the soundness of the opinions I have quoted, and if the Indian cultivator gains by a low exchange, the converse of the proposition, that he absolutely suffers from high exchange, must hold good. They further seem to bear out what he himself told us of the increasing indebtedness of the Indian peasantry.

Now, Sir, if these effects are such as I have stated them, as regards gold standard countries, as regards the country further East where the exchange varies with the movements of the white metal, the effect is still more disastrous. The Indian manufacturer, having to sell his goods in dollars, finds that when he converts those dollars into rupees, he only gets 130 for every 100 dollars, while formerly when the exchange between the two countries was on the same basis, he got no less than 220 rupees. Sir, this is a serious loss, and when we consider that these disabilities are coincident with the growing competition of Japan, the question of India's loss can be perfectly well measured by the House. And now comes the gravest blow of all. You have by a stroke of the pen reduced to a considerable extent the intrinsic value of the savings of the people. These are invested in ornaments or ingots of uncoined silver. They are hoarded against a rainy day. They used to be disposed of weight for weight against the rupee. Now they can only obtain one-half. Has this arbitrary knocking-off of half the garnered wealth of the poor had no effect upon their power of resistance, their capacity of self-sustenance on occasions of famine? Does not this lend point and substance to the accusation freely made by demagogues and agitators, interested agitators if you like to say so, in whose mouths a weapon of this sort can be used with the most telling and damaging effect, that the last famine was more a rupee than a grain famine. We hear pæans sung in speaking of the surpluses achieved, and yet in 1894–1895, though exchange was at its very lowest, the Budget was balanced with a substantial surplus. While all the economic manifestations point to the great probability, I put it no higher than that, that the poorer classes are being ground out of existence by the juggernaut car of the State rupee, and while the lines of the peasant appear to have fallen in anything but pleasant places, the manufacturing classes, as I have already tried to show, are about as badly off. And why? You have imposed—and both Parties are tarred with the same brush — excise duties on the handicraft of the Indian, out of sheer pusillanimity, ostensibly in the name of some pedantic sacrosanct doctrine, some Cobden Club heterodoxy, but really to prevent,—and with all deference to the altruism of the Member for Oldham—the coarser kinds of yarn and cloth, and these constitute the chief productions of the Indian mill, from interfering with and shutting out, some portion of Lancashire goods. Where in the name of all that is reasonable is the justice or justification of your action? I see no redeeming feature in this sordid squalor of electoral pre-occupation. In our Colonies protection is rampant, and more flagrantly and more outrageously rampant in that the goods from the mother country are indiscriminately attacked with those of the foreigner. We have reduced the value in rupees of the farmer's produce, we have caused his hard-earned savings to shrink to one-half, we have brought the various industries to the brink of ruin; and does my noble friend, with all this cumulative evidence before him, seriously believe that he has allayed the apprehensions or met the objections of those who, rightly or wrongly, think that substantial grounds exist, that there is a strong presumption in favour of investigation since the 16-penny rupee was crystallized into stability, by riding off on the conclusions of the Fowler Committee? I would ask my noble friend what self-respecting economic observer would be satisfied with the deductions and conclusions gained under the circumstances of that Committee. I would appeal to him, not to turn a deaf ear to those plaints and remonstrances, faint though they be, which reach this House from the people of India. I appeal to him, as the Member for Kilmarnock did in his vigorous philippics, not to be inveigled and overpowered by the miasmic opinions of the bureaucratic element that abhors change and inquiry as much as nature abhors a vacuum. I have had some experience of this inertia, of this aversion to the brushing away of cobwebs, of secret arrangements and mystifications in the region of cables. A sacred charge lies on each of us, and my noble friend, if he spurns their tribulations, if he disdains to inquire into them, would be gratuitously assuming responsibility of the gravest kind. If so, I would venture to hope that, with the assistance and sympathy of this House, I may be allowed to appeal to the tribunal of public opinion to make effective these representations, and while in no way pre-judging the issues that cluster round this matter, we may send an eirenicon of hope to the sorely-tried, though staunchly loyal, people of India.

*(2.0.) MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) expressed his satisfaction that the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India stated in the speech he made the other day that the Land Revenue in future would be collected with moderation, that the subject of technical education would receive more attention, and that a larger amount of money would be spent upon it. He was glad, also, that the noble Lord held out some hope that the salt tax would be lightened. That tax pressed heavily upon the millions of people in India. Perhaps for the present, however, the Government of India had adopted a better course in writing off a large portion of the arrears of the land assessment. Last year the amount cancelled was £1,300,000. These arrears were largely attributable to the famine. The holdings of the ryots in India averaged two and a half acres of land, and their arrears averaged fifteen rupees, or £1 sterling. He regretted the large number of evictions which had been carried out—the number in the Presidency of Madras during eleven years, from 1879–80 to 1880–90 inclusive—were 840,713. It was terrible to contemplate the suffering which this involved, for it meant the turning of families out of their homes and taking everything from them. As the result of those evictions 1,963,364 acres of land were put up to auction, but the Government were only successful in selling 779,142 acres, the remaining 1,184,222 acres being bought in by the Government at an average of 1½d. per acre. That fact illustrated the extreme poverty of the people. They were unable to buy land even at that low figure. It was through no fault of their own that they fell into arrears, and he could only hope that the money-lenders did not reap much benefit through the remission of arrears of assessment. He trusted that the noble Lord would take care that more agricultural banks were established. These banks were in the experimental stage at the present time, and he hoped they would prove successful, for it was important that everything possible should be done to get rid of the money-lender, who undoubtedly was one of the greatest curses of the ryotwari of India. Next to the prevention of evictions, about the best way in which money could be spent was in the spread of technical education. On his recent visit to India he inspected the workshops and technical school which had been established by the Gaikwar of Baroda, where he found a large number of young men anxious to get technical instruction and a knowledge of mechanical work. He also visited the boot and shoe and saddlery factory at Gwalior. There the best American and European machinery was in operation, and the establishment was being run on the most satisfactory lines. He looked for good results from the development of industrial pursuits, which would enable the people to get away from agriculture, in connection with which there was nothing but misery and starvation. In support of his contention that the Government of India should encourage technical education and the development of manufacturing industries, he quoted from a lecture recently delivered in London by Sir H. Cotton, late Chief Commissioner of Assam. The greatest good, said the lecturer, that could be conferred on India was technical education and the restoration of industrial enterprises.

The hon. Member condemned the system with respect to official service, which resulted in the burdening of the finances of India with enormously heavy pensions. This arose in a large measure from the fact that Government officials were allowed to retire too soon. He advocated longer service for the officials. He did not know, after all, that the climate of India was so trying as was sometimes stated. An Indian official drove down to his office at twelve or one o'clock and spent two or three hours there. The sahib was waited upon by a number of servants, and on the whole, the conditions of his life were such that he should not be able to retire at the early age he did now. Many of these Indian officials, on coming back to this country, engaged in all sorts of pursuits. If they were obliged to serve a few years longer that would be one way of lightening the burden of Indian finance which, he thought, would certainly give satisfaction. He was glad that Lord Curzon was realising the importance of dealing with the question of the Indian police. In regard to Indian railways, he said that, while it was true they had been constructed at a heavy cost, it was a good thing they had been constructed, for, looking to the hostile feeling entertained towards the British by some of the frontier tribes, it was of great importance that we should have facilities for the rapid transport of troops and guns. Moreover, railways were of the greatest value in the development of the country. The time had come when a great deal more should be done in the way of irrigation. The Maharaja of Jeypore during the famine put a large number of people to work on irrigating a tract of land which now looked like a beautiful garden. All around there was nothing but desert, and what had been done at that place was an illustration of what could be accomplished by means of irrigation. He suggested that loans might be raised specially for irrigation purposes. Irrigation works had done much to improve the condition of the fellaheen of Egypt, and he had no doubt that similar works would do much to benefit the people of India. He was glad to find that so able a man as Sir Colin Scott Moncrief had been despatched to India to investigate the whole question of irrigation. He hoped the Government would submit the report of that gentleman, who was so able to deal with matters of that kind, to the House of Commons. Then there was the question of the housing of the native troops. He had been very glad to notice that the housing of the European troops was all that could be desired everywhere; but the Native troops were atrociously housed in places not fit for pig-styes. Now they should do what they could to house these men comfortably. We had to depend upon them to fight our battles, and to stand by us in times of need. He could assure the noble Lord that there was very considerable dissatisfaction amongst them in regard to the condition of their cantonments. He was told that there had been a slight improvement in getting better houses in some districts, and he hoped that the Government of India would see to it that all the Native troops were housed in places in which human beings could live. He must refer the noble Lord to the question of currency notes in India. It was a surprise to him to find that, after supplying himself with a sufficient number of currency notes in Bombay or Calcutta, he could not change them everywhere in India. In Darjeeling, for instance, they could not be cashed at all, except through the courtesy of a merchant. That was rather hard lines, and there was something wrong somewhere. He knew that the answer would be made that the currency officials in Calcutta were against any change in the present system, because they said it would cause additional trouble in the Department. That was nonsense—it would give them a little more work to do; the Government offices ought to be run on business principles. The noble Lord had said that there was great credit due to the Works Department. He did not think so. He had called at the Works Department in regard to the overcrowding of third - class carriages and other matters. He was glad to hear that Lord Curzon was looking into this matter, and that India has in him a Viceroy who spared no pains in his work. As to automatic brakes, the law in this country was that there should be automatic brakes on every passenger train, but there were many trains in India that ran for hundreds of miles without automatic brakes. And yet that was on State Railways! There ought to be an automatic brake on every passenger train in India. The noble Lord said that our rule in India was a rule of justice, and not of force. He doubted that. There was the case of Sirdar Natu and his brother, both of Poona, who had been arrested and kept in prison for two years without trial, and then the prison doors were thrown open and they were told to go. They got no compensation for alleged illegal seizure of their personal property, and no attention has been paid to their representations, which, in fact, have never been acknowledged. Again, there was the case of Krishna Rao Raghunath, grandson of Bapu Raghunath Dewan of Dhar. Bapu had six sons, one of whom, Ramchandra Roa, was suspected of complicity in the Mutiny. Not only was Ramchandra's property confiscated, but that of every member of his family, although all these had been true to the British Crown. That was not the rule of justice, but the rule of force. Two of the descendants of Bapu, viz., Krishna Rao Raghunath and Shanka Rao Bhagwant, are respectively entitled to a sixth share of Bapu's estate, and they should not be made to suffer because a relative was not true in his allegiance to the British Crown. He trusted that the noble Lord would look into these matters himself. He had heard nothing but praise everywhere about the government of Lord Curzon. It would be a God-send to the people of India if Lord Curzon's stay were prolonged for five years beyond the ordinary term. His Lordship had done magnificent work in India, and he urged the India Office at home to support him in his efforts to bring about a better state of things in India.

*(3.0) COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I would ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I call attention to a matter which has been much commented upon in the Press, and has been the subject of Questions in this House. I refer to the punishment by the Government of India of the 9th Lancers. On Monday last I put a Question to my noble friend the Secretary of State for India as to whether he would cause a full and independent inquiry to be made into this case, and I was informed that my request could not be granted because the matter was a question of military discipline. If it were merely a question of military discipline I would not bring the matter before this House, but I think it is a question of much greater importance, affecting the administration of justice in India and the relations between the white and coloured races in that country.

The circumstances of the case are briefly these. In April last the 9th Lancers returned to India from South Africa, after two and a half years' service in that country. They were sent to Sialkote, in the Punjab. On the night of their arrival they were entertained by the other regiments on the station. That same night a native cook employed in the regiment, who had been turned out of the cook-house earlier in the day for being drunk, was found lying about two miles from the cavalry lines cruelly ill-treated—so cruelly that he died within a few days. Steps were at once taken to find out who was implicated in this ill-treatment, and a regimental inquiry was held. They could get no information on the point. A second independent inquiry was ordered by the General Commanding, and he was unable to get a trace of the offenders. A civil inquiry was held, with practically the same result. This native made a statement to the effect that he had been ill-treated by soldiers, and, as he believed, by the 9th Lancers. Another native, who was with him, stated that the man had been ill-treated by soldiers, but the night was so dark that he could not distinguish who they were. The officers of the 9th Lancers offered a reward of 500 rupees for the apprehension of the offender, and that led to no result. The Government of India were not satisfied with the evidence that had been adduced; they made up their minds that the 9th Lancers were guilty, and they ordered them severe punishment. All officers and men on leave in India were recalled, and it was ordered that no leave should be given until June, 1903. Extra sentries were posted on all regimental buildings, and the regiment was ordered to be removed to another station not so popular as their present one, and they were further ordered not to attend the Durbar at Delhi. That part of the punishment has been remitted. I am not sure that it would not have been better if it had been retained. The 9th Lancers formed part of that small army which, in the year 1857, held the Ridge at Delhi against all the assaults of the rebels until the city was taken. On that Ridge stands a memorial to all those who fell—"Erected by their comrades who lament their loss, and the Government whom they have served so well," and it would be perhaps better that that regiment should not be brought back to Delhi after forty-five years absence, suffering under a punishment which had been inflicted by a Government which they believed had served them so badly. The evidence in this case was that of the injured man himself and that of another native. Native evidence is notoriously unreliable, and anyone acquainted with India knows of the four-anna witnesses who surround the courts there, and who, for the payment of that small sum, are prepared to give evidence for either side. It might possibly be said in this case that the man was dying, and that his statement should be received as a dying declaration, but that could hardly be contended, because in the "Manual of Military Law," with which all officers make themselves acquainted, it says—

> "Dying declarations," said Mr. Justice Byles, "ought to be admitted with scrupulous, I had almost said, with superstitious care. They have not necessarily the sanction of an oath; they are made in the absence of the prisoner; the person making them is not subject to cross-examination, and is in no peril of prosecution for perjury. There is also great danger of omissions and of misrepresentations, both by the declarant and the witness. To make a dying declaration admissible, there must be an expectation of impending and almost immediate death from the causes then operating. The authorities show that there must be *no hope* whatever."

Therefore I do not think it can be contended in this case, that the statement of this native can be looked upon as a dying declaration.

The reason I have brought this question forward is not, as I have said before, because it is solely one of military discipline, but because it affects the administration of justice generally. I desire to enter my sincere and emphatic protest against this general punishment of a regiment for an offence which might have been committed by one or more of their number, and it is for that reason I have brought this forward. In reply to a Question put on Monday last by the hon. Member for Essex, my noble friend the Secretary of State for India stated that it was reasonably certain that the assailants were men of the 9th Lancers. I do not think the law admits "reasonable certainty." Reasonable certainty admits a doubt, and it is, I believe, the law of this country that in a case of doubt the accused gets the benefit of it. The noble Lord went on to say this punishment had been inflicted because the regimental authorities had been guilty of neglect. I do not know what further inquiry could have been made, but if any officer has been guilty of neglect of duty, then it is for the authorities to deal with that question, as they are perfectly able to do under the King's Regulations. I submit that every attempt has been made to discover the offenders in this case. Another Question was put to my noble friend the Secretary of State, which was as to whether this punishment met with the approval of the military authorities, and his answer was that it did. The information which I have in my possession leads me to believe that that is not so. I am informed that the military authorities and the Government of India are not at one upon this point, and that is the reason why I thought it my duty to bring it forward, because it is not a question of military discipline, but a matter of justice.

What is the punishment in this case? It is one which I suppose is intended to uphold military discipline and protect the natives of India. With regard to military discipline I am convinced that a general punishment of this sort is not the thing to maintain it, and my experience is that discipline is best maintained by absolute fairness, and not by harsh and indiscriminate punishment. The effect of a general punishment is to make those who are perfectly innocent discontented and unhappy. But this case goes far beyond that. I have seen letters in which it is said that the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men feel this military slander deeply, especially after the way in which they have maintained the name of the regiment. It is not the officers and non-commissioned officers and men only that it affects. It affects the officers of the past, and all those who have friends and relations in the regiment now. Among other things I am informed that the draft that is on its way to India now is to suffer the same punishment, and that the punishment will apply to all those drafts that go to India to this regiment, and all the officers who may join the regiment between this and the 1st of June, 1903. I have said that I desire to protest against this general punishment which I consider antiquated, barbarous, and vindictive. It is a punishment which I believe is Chinese in its origin, and it is vindictive because it will be made to apply to those who could not by any possibility have been guilty. I have asked that a full and independent inquiry should be made into all the circumstances of the case. I ask that that inquiry shall be full, shall be independent of the military authorities, and independent of the Government of India, and I make that request in the interest of this distinguished regiment, to which India owes so much.

*(3.20.) LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): In my opinion, this is a very serious case, on grounds other than those on which my hon. and gallant friend has based his statement. We are gradually getting into a state in which the public and the Press and this House are constantly interfering in questions of discipline. Such intervention must be absolutely fatal to the government of the services. At the same time I think that this deplorable state of affairs has been brought about through the agency of those in authority. What has raised this feeling in the Press and the public? It is a question of collective punishment, and anybody who has ever had anything to do with the administration of men and boys knows that collective punishment is absolutely futile for the purpose of finding out anything at all. I can give my experience in the Royal Navy, and I have some experience of regiments. Those that have experience know perfectly well that discipline is often very irritating, but they also know that we have to suffer from that irritation and to obey orders. They also know that during those moments of irritation in the barrack room, or on the lower deck, seven-eighths of the men are entirely on the side of authority, and endeavour to dissuade those who are inclined to insubordination from making fools of themselves. What is the result? In the 9th Lancers you may depend upon it that seven-eighths of the men and non-commissioned officers are trying to find out who in the regiment killed this man. The authorities thought it right to punish the whole regiment, and the result is that you have the seven-eighths of the men who desire to support authority 20 per cent. more angry than the others, because they feel they are suffering the injustice of the punishment. Justice and discipline are not by any means synonymous terms. In justice you have the admission of extenuating circumstances, but in discipline you have not. A breach of discipline has to be punished, and the punishment has to be accepted. Sandhurst is a case in point. At Sandhurst there were some fires lit in the college, the authority inflicted a collective punishment. What was the result? Although seven-eighths of these young men were probably loyal to authority, they lost their tempers, went outside, and broke the rules. That was an offence against discipline and had to be punished. If it had not been a question of discipline, but of justice, there would have been extenuating circumstances to take into account, because a number of these young men had been punished for something with which they had nothing whatever to do.

There is another point with regard to collective punishment. Take a school, a regiment, or a ship's company. Who is regarded with the greatest horror? The informer and the sneak. Collective punishment is a premium on the informer and the sneak; and collective punishment never yet brought out information among such communities. The Secretary of State for War appears to doubt my word. I can only say I have never been a shipmate or a schoolmate with a sneak. As far as discipline goes it is necessary, no matter what discipline you enforce on the men under your command, to be strict, and men will submit so long as the matter is one purely of discipline, in which they do extra duty or something of that kind. If you administer your discipline badly you will get the men irritated and insubordinate and have to punish them collectively. Now, it might be asked what punishment would I give? The punishment which I would have given in the case of Sandhurst would have been to call these young men before me and tell them I was going to put so many of them on duty as sentries in pairs day and night, and that if a fire occurred where they were sentries they would be discharged with disgrace. There would then have been no mutiny. I would have dealt similarly with the 9th Lancers. I would have put extra officers on duty, extra pickets. If the non-commissioned officers' pickets had not been enough, I would have put on officers' pickets; and if that were not enough, the whole regiment. Men will never refuse to do their duty. In the case of a difficulty on board a ship, I would not order the ship to remain at a certain place for a month and forbid the officers and men to go ashore. That would bring about a mutiny to a certainty. I would send the ship steaming out to sea and give the men extra duty, or march them twice round an island if necessary, and there would not be a word said. As to the plea of "reasonable certainty" a court of law would not hang a cat on a reasonably certain charge. Here a whole regiment is punished because it is thought reasonably certain that one or more men had beaten this unfortunate Hindu. My noble friend said that the regimental authorities had not made reasonable attempts to discover the offenders. I am sorry to say I do not believe a word of it.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Do you know what they did?

*LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: The noble Lord is quite right; I do not know; and if the noble Lord instead of saying that had told us what they did do he might have prevented needless irritation. I only base my speech on my personal knowledge of that distinguished regiment. For many years I had a distinguished brother in the 9th Lancers, and from what I have known of the regiment for years, I am confident that the officers used every effort to find whether any soldier in the regiment beat the Hindu. The authorities are to blame for the way in which they have dealt with the case of Sandhurst, and they are to blame for the way in which they have dealt with this case. Possibly, the distinguished administrator who is Viceroy of India has some reason which has not been made public for punishing the regiment, but the manner in which the punishment has been inflicted is entirely wrong, and I hope the noble Lord will give some explanatory reason why it occurred at all; but whatever reason he gives, from my point of view, the collective punishment of the 9th Lancers was injurious and a punishment not calculated to find out who was the offender. It is bad for the service that such a punishment should be given, and it is a bad thing for the public to raise matters of discipline before the whole country.

*(3.30.) CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): In taking part in this debate I desire to make it perfectly clear that I have had no communication, either direct or indirect, with anyone in this regiment since this occurrence. I do not wish to deal with the matter from the narrow point of a regimental scandal—there are far greater issues at stake. We have here under review the three questions of discipline, justice, and expediency. The question in which I naturally, like the two hon. and gallant Members who have already spoken, take deep interest is that of discipline. Recently there has been a tendency, especially on the part of civilians, to look upon discipline as a secondary consideration, because in the recent war the Boers made a gallant defence without having had any special military training, such as that imposed on Continental armies. But I would point out that there was in the Boer forces discipline of the highest kind, inasmuch as the men were serving under officers up to whom they looked as their natural leaders in times of peace, men who were closely associated with them, and who knew their characters in all respects. Therefore, in addition to the ordinary physical discipline, there was what I may call moral discipline.

The questions I ask are these: Has the action of the Indian Government been such as to improve discipline, or has it not been rather to defeat it? Has the course adopted by the Viceroy effected its purpose? Have the culprits been discovered? I think not. I may point to an analogous case, which will be in the recollection certainly of some of the military Members of the House. In 1891 a Captain Von K—— in the German army was murdered near the Prussian frontier. Whilst standing outside the riding school this officer was shot through the heart, and the smoking musket with which the deed had been committed was discovered in the vicinity of the school where he had been drilling some of his men. There were also a number of men in the stables and barracks close by. What action did the German Government take? It cannot be denied that the German army is the first army in the world, more especially where discipline is concerned. The German Emperor, who is the head of the army, who occupies a position which no person in this country occupies, and who, besides being a man of great ability is of undaunted courage, having a free hand, did what? He did not punish the regiment collectively, but he sent special detectives from Berlin to inquire into the character of the particular squadron, and into the sayings and doings of the men. Four months afterwards three men were brought to trial, and acquitted. Why? Because there was a reasonable doubt, as there is in this case. It is well known that it is a simple matter to get Russian escaped convicts, some of whom are always endeavouring to cross the frontier, to commit any crime for a mere nothing, because they carry their lives in their hands, and it was quite within the bounds of possibility that one of these men had been procured to commit that crime.

I may say that many years ago I served at this particular station of Sialkote for three or four years with another Lancer regiment. I took one of these very cook boys on an expedition to the hills; he assaulted a native of the country, and I had to pay for his misconduct. It is well known that in this district there are a number of ne'er-do-wells and criminals who, having escaped into the native city of Sialkote, try to obtain service as cook boys. Like all conquered races, East Indians are very subtle, and would have no hesitation whatever, having perpetrated an outrage themselves, in endeavouring to throw suspicion on the shoulders of some European regiment, and if there is one regiment more than another that they would select it is the 9th Lancers, because that particular regiment did most gallant and distinguished service in the whole of the Punjab War and the Indian Mutiny.

Before passing to the question of justice, I may state that I have not a word to say against the noble Lord, who has had such a distinguished career in India, and who, I frankly admit, is to be excused in a great measure for the action he has taken, because it is his duty and our duty to show the natives of India that they cannot be ill-treated with impunity by Europeans, that their lives and property are under the protection of the Emperor of India, and that they can appeal with confidence to us to protect them in all respects. But what effect will this punishment, if it is continued, have upon the people of India? This collective punishment will be resented by the European soldiers in India, and there will be a reflex action on the part of the natives. The latter, with their great astuteness, will know how to insult the European soldiers, who will, of course, retaliate. This system of general punishment may sometimes succeed with school boys and with uncivilised races, who are practically children, but there is a great difference between boys and men. Men have greater fixity of purpose; their characters are more formed; they have greater fortitude and wider experience of life, and this form of punishment is bound to fail, particularly where the British soldier is concerned. By moving the regiment to another station you are only sowing the dragon's teeth, because every European soldier in the station will take up the quarrel, and there will be a state of perpetual friction between the people of India and the European garrison. It will be only human nature for every one of the 200,000 men in the Indian Army to side with their kith and kin, and thus a deplorable state of affairs will be created. And what effect will it have in this country? A large number of time-expired men are about to come home from India, and in a year or two, if not now, there will be a great difficulty in obtaining sufficient men to replace those whose time has expired. We should be face to face with a great recruiting difficulty, and what will be the story that these time-expired men will be spreading about the country? That any man who joins the army will be liable at any moment to be punished for an offence of which he is totally innocent. It will be the death-blow to recruiting.

In conclusion I would ask the Secretary of State to suggest to his noble friend the Viceroy that now he has shown to the natives of India his desire to protect them, he should, in the interests of expediency, put an end to this punishment. He has ample excuse for doing so, because in a short time we are to have this great Durbar, when India is to rejoice at the accession of her new Emperor. A good opportunity presents itself, therefore, for doing that which will help discipline, is nothing but bare justice, and is undoubtedly most expedient.

*(3.45.) LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no right to speak in this debate, as I have already addressed the House, but as speeches have been made directly impugning the action of the military authorities in India, I am sure the House will allow me for a few minutes to occupy their attention. It is with great regret that I am compelled to say what I shall say in the next few minutes. If my advice had been taken, this case would never have been brought up in the House of Commons. It is a very serious matter to bring forward a case of this kind, for two reasons. The action taken has been disciplinary, it was taken on the authority of the highest military personages in India, and it is bad for military discipline that action so taken should be reviewed in this House. I have no fault to find with the tone and substance of the speeches which have been made, but unquestionably my hon. and gallant friends have been supplied with *ex parte* statements. I am compelled, therefore, to do that which I would rather not have done—to state the facts of the case, the exact nature of the punishment inflicted, and the consequences of that punishment. It is perfectly true that this is not a military question alone, but a question of the administration of justice. I am glad that my noble friend the Member for Woolwich expressed in such clear and emphatic terms that, so far as he was concerned, he would do everything in his power to stop Europeans in India in any way misusing their position by assaulting or attacking natives. That is a feeling which unanimously animates this House; but I am bound to state that during my tenure of office cases have come up where natives have been violently assaulted, maltreated, and in some cases have died, and I am bound to add that the investigations made into those malpractices were not so prompt as they should have been, nor so quick as they would have been if the assaulted had been a European. It must be borne in mind that we have in India an absolutely unique Empire, consisting of 300 millions of natives, subject to 200,000 white people at the outside, including men, women, and children. Nowhere is the British soldier treated with greater consideration, and nowhere, on the whole, does he behave better. But these cases of violence and outrage have from time to time occurred. Lord Curzon, from the time he took up his office, has exercised the whole of his great powers and influence in impressing upon his white countrymen that it is their duty to investigate such outrages with the utmost promptitude, and with just as sincere a desire to bring home justice to the culprits as if the conditions were reversed and it was a white man who had been assaulted by a native.

What occurred in this case? The 9th Lancers, a magnificent regiment, with as fine a record behind it as any regiment in the British Army, after most distinguished service in South Africa, arrived in India and went to Sialkote. It was entertained on the night of its arrival, and I am afraid there was some heavy drinking. At 9 o'clock, or a little past, on that night a native cook, who had been taken on in connection with some work in the kitchen, was brutally assaulted within twenty-five yards of one of the kitchens of the cantonment occupied by the 9th Lancers. The poor wretch managed to crawl away, and in the morning he was found in an almost moribund condition not far from the officers' mess. His eyes were bunged up, his head and body bore marks of fists—natives do not fight with their fists—two of his ribs were broken, and he was a mass of bruises and contusions. The police traced clearly the place where the assault took place; there were large patches of blood on the spot. The man at once made a statement to the effect that he was assaulted by two members of the 9th Lancers, and that they assaulted him because he failed to procure for them native women. He lived only for a few days, but from the time he made his first deposition until he died he always adhered to the statement that he had been assaulted by two men of the 9th Lancers. The officer commanding at Sialkote telegraphed to the Indian Government to say that an assault had been committed on a cook by two members of the 9th Lancers, and that he had ordered officers commanding 9th Lancers to hold an immediate inquiry. No immediate inquiry was held. Nothing was done till the man died, six or seven days afterwards. Then a court of inquiry was held of a most perfunctory character. Two captains and one subaltern constituted the Court. They summoned four native witnesses. The evidence of those witnesses certainly tended to corroborate the dying statement of the man, because two of them asserted that they saw the cook assaulted by two men, but it was so dark, and they were so frightened that they ran away and could not actually identify the persons who committed the assault. Not a single white man, not a single person connected with the regiment, was called before the Court. The Court reported to the commanding officer, and the commanding officer, in forwarding the report, stated that it was difficult to detect the guilty persons because there was only native evidence to rely upon. The case went on to the Lieutenant-General, who at once characterised the inquiry as one of a most meagre and perfunctory character, and ordered a fresh inquiry; and on that Court no officer of the incriminated regiment sat. I have no doubt the carelessness or heedlessness was not intentional; but still it must occur to any one that, when a regiment like the 9th Lancers, with such a record, had an outrage of this kind imputed to them, it was the bounden duty of the officers to lose no opportunity and to exhaust every means at their disposal to clear their regiment from the stigma which had been cast upon them. The second court of inquiry failed to obtain sufficient evidence to identify the culprits. The military authorities then sent down General Combe, who addressed the 9th Lancers and used very plain language to them, imploring them to assist in bringing to justice those who had perpetrated this outrage. A day or two afterwards a native was killed by a member of the 9th Lancers. It was one of the old stories. He was a punkah coolie, who had been kicked violently by some soldier, and died in consequence. [AN HON. MEMBER: He had no boots on.] The soldier swore he had no boots on, but the natives swore that he had. He was brought up before a civil court, and fined. This was the second case of a native—assuming for a moment that the 9th Lancers were responsible for the first case—being done to death in the course of about two months. The military authorities took a serious view of the situation, and suggested that punishment should be inflicted upon them, and they further suggested that the 9th Lancers should not be allowed to attend the Delhi Durbar. The punishment inflicted, therefore, originated with the military authorities, and had their full sanction throughout.

Collective punishment has been strongly condemned, but I will undertake to say that my noble and gallant friends who take that view have in the course of their lives constantly and perpetually inflicted collective punishment. It is of the very essence of military discipline. It is the beginning and end of it. What is the most ordinary punishment in the Army? If a company or troop does not, through the fault of a few, drill well, the whole body gets extra drill.

*LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: That is duty.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: It is collective punishment in order to bring up the company or troop to the standard of efficiency. My noble friend says that if he had had charge of this case he would have inflicted a commonsense punishment, which, as far as I understand it, was to put the whole of the 9th Lancers on extra sentry duty. My noble friend is a much severer taskmaster than the Indian Government, because all the latter have done is to put an extra sentry at every bungalow for a year. Would my hon. and gallant friend exempt the officers from punishment, or would he put them on extra sentry go? Sentry-go, however, would be more resented by an officer than having his leave stopped. The Government of India hold that a regiment must be treated as a military unit, and that, if punishment is inflicted on the men, the officers could not be exempted. Therefore they stopped for a year the leave of the officers and put the punishment mentioned on the men. Not very long ago collective punishment was inflicted upon another regiment, and great exception was taken. A very serious and discreditable outrage occurred in

Rangoon in a British regiment. I do not want for a moment to liken the case we are discussing to that outrage. But there again justice was baffled, and baffled for want of energy on the part of the civil and military authorities. It was a disgraceful case. Lord Curzon told me that he was co-operating with the military authorities and would do everything in his power to bring the perpetrators of that outrage to justice. A collective punishment was imposed on that regiment with the consent of the military authorities. What is the sequel to that? In the middle of the Boer war, when calumnies and falsehoods were being circulated all over Europe against our Army, a friend of mine, who has taken a bold part, and wielded a facile and powerful literary pen, was living abroad and exercising that pen on behalf of the reputation of the British soldier and the credit of the British Government. That gentleman wrote to me to say that a scandalous lie was being circulated in the papers throughout Central Europe. That statement was an exaggerated statement of this case at Rangoon, and he asked me to authorise him to say that the statement was untrue. I was unable to do that, but I was able to show my friend that when the Government failed to detect the perpetrators of that outrage they showed their displeasure by inflicting collective punishment, and to save the reputation of the British Army and the credit of the British Government by showing clearly that they had no desire to connive at or hush up the outrage. In this case also it is the duty of the Government and of the military authorities to show their disapproval of the failure to bring the perpetrators of this outrage to justice. What has occurred? I have received a telegram from the Government of India which contains a statement of the case which they have published in India. And this is the first result of the collective punishment to which my hon. and gallant friend has objected—

> "The commanding officer of the 9th Lancers has brought to notice of Government the identity of one, if not both, of guilty men in the regiment now reasonably suspected, and in one of two instances is almost certain. But the case against them, which rests in the main upon admissions made by themselves to their comrades, but since repudiated, is insufficient to obtain judicial conviction."

I dare say there will be some indignation, but that indignation will be in the regiment and not outside, and will be directed, not against the Government of India, but against the men who have brought discredit and disrepute upon them. These are cases which, I am thankful to say, do not often occur; but when they do occur, certainly, so far as I am concerned, I shall exercise all my authority in supporting Lord Curzon and the military authorities in India in bringing the perpetrators to justice. I shall not hesitate to support collective punishment if there is reason to believe that a military unit has, through certain of its members, misconducted itself and committed outrages, and there is any attempt on the part of the remainder of the members of that unit to shield the delinquent. This question is a very big one, and I have no time to argue it fully. But if we have been more successful than any other European nation in establishing our authority amongst coloured races, what is the secret of our success? It is not merely that we assert our power as a governing race, but because, when we establish our authority, we associate with it perfect equality under the law and before the law between all races, both criminally and civilly. That is the foundation of our power; that is the source of our strength. Much as I value the reputation of a noble regiment such as the 9th Lancers, there is something that I value more, and that is the credit of the whole British Army and the reputation of the British Government; and I maintain that, in this case, the action taken by the Indian Government, although it may have reflected on the reputation of that regiment, has maintained the credit of the British Government and of the British Army.

(4.10.) **LORD ALWYNE COMPTON** (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade): I shall detain the House but a few moments. After what the noble Lord has said, I think it is only right that we should not stand in a false position. The information which has reached me from the very beginning is from a relative of my own who is at present serving in a high rank in that regiment. There are one or two things which the noble Lord has said which I should like to answer. As far as collective punishment is concerned, I am not one who is in favour of that punishment, but in this particular case it seems to me that it was not a question of collective punishment but a question as to whether there should have been any punishment whatever. The noble Lord at the commencement of his speech said that it was with great regret that he had to say what he has told the House. I may say that what he has told us has been common knowledge in India ever since the beginning of this case. The noble Lord has referred to a second case in which a punkah coolie has been killed. I think it is quite fair that the House should know not only of the first case but the circumstances of the second case also. My hon. and gallant friend who commenced this discussion perhaps had his own reasons for not alluding to this second case, but it seems to me that it is necessary now to state the facts. In the second case the death of the coolie was, it is quite true, due to a kick by a soldier. When the punkah stopped, the soldier woke up, went outside the bungalow, found the coolie asleep, and kicked him. The native died, and the case was reported. The man was brought before the jury and tried for manslaughter, but he was acquitted. He was then tried for assault, and was again acquitted. Finally he was condemned for a technical assault, and the punishment he received was a fine of fifty rupees.

There was a third case, which was also in the 9th Lancers, but in this instance there was no loss of life. A subaltern, who was quite a boy, while on duty with a detachment of his regiment saw a native ill-treating a pony. He quarrelled with the native, knocked him down, and broke his nose. The subaltern was brought before the magistrate and was fined fifty rupees. The noble Lord the Member for Woolwich has asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House the reasons which induced the Government of India to inflict this punishment on the 9th Lancers. I venture to suggest that those other cases might have had some effect upon the minds of the Government of India and the military authorities, but let me point this out to the House. I am one of those who have served in India for five years, and whilst I was there I never ceased to condemn in the most strenuous manner the ill-treatment of the natives. This ill-treatment was constantly taking place, and I had often to speak about it, and in my regiment we often had to punish most severely any ill-treatment of natives which was detected. That is my position, but now let us see how it applies to this case. You have had three cases. One was the case in which a native died, and you were not able to trace the crime to anybody in the 9th Lancers. Two other cases were traced to this company, and what happened? I should have been inclined to suggest that in this case a more severe punishment than a fine of fifty rupees should have been inflicted where the two culprits were found out, if any impression was to be made upon the company. In one of these cases a man came forward and owned that he was the culprit. Therefore, in this case, where the culprit was actually found, a fine of fifty rupees only was imposed. Then there was the first case to deal with in which the culprit was not found. The Government of India said that the culprit must be found, and General Combe was sent down to hold a most searching investigation, and he absolutely failed to find any proof that it was one of the 9th Lancers that had committed the crime. It is perfectly true that this native, on his death-bed, said it was a horse soldier who committed the assault upon him, and therefore the outrage was attributed to the 9th Lancers. The noble Lord did not tell the House that the doctor who attended this native in the hospital, and who gave evidence at the inquiry, had himself stated that he did not attribute the death of this native to ill-treatment. That was before the inquiry was held, and the doctor there stated that in his opinion the death of this boy was not due to the ill-treatment he had received. It was shown that the boy had been suffering from other things, and at any rate it was agreed that his death was not due to this cause.

There is one other charge made by the noble Lord, that the 9th Lancers did not proceed earlier to make the investigation which they ultimately did make. An investigation was held, and two captains and a subaltern held a court of inquiry. So far as I can gather it was held at once. The noble Lord says that they did not call any witnesses, but you cannot invent witnesses. What witnesses were there to call? This affair took place at night.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The second court of inquiry did call witnesses, therefore I assume that they might have been called before. They called the non-commissioned officers who were in the neighbourhood.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON: It may be right to say that the inquiry was stupidly conducted, but that is a very different thing from saying that the regiment conspired to conceal a criminal. The censure upon the regiment was that there had been concealment of the criminal. I have very little doubt that I am rightly interpreting the feelings of the 9th Lancers when I say that the charge that they are wilfully conspiring to conceal a criminal is what they resent very much. As to the punishment inflicted upon the whole regiment and stopping their leave, I am sure that the 9th Lancers consider that punishment as nothing compared to the stigma cast upon them of concealing a criminal in a case which is not proved against them, which the general officer tried to prove, and which the officers themselves tried to prove by offering a reward of 500 rupees in order to endeavour to ascertain the criminals. In spite of all this there was an absolute failure to find the perpetrators of this crime. I do not think the regiment deserves a stigma of that kind placed upon them of having concealed within their ranks a criminal, in a case in which they have done their utmost to find out the culprit. I think to have a stigma of that kind placed upon a gallant regiment, which has not only done good service in South Africa recently, but which during the whole time it has existed as a regiment has acquired a great reputation, is something which will be resented very bitterly, and for the whole regiment to be punished for a case of this kind certainly seems to anyone who has made himself acquainted with the facts a travesty of justice.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not rise to say anything about the 9th Lancers, but I simply intervene in order to remind the House that when the Government gave an additional day for the Indian Budget, I think the House will remember that it was understood that part of that day should be devoted to the consideration of the second Order on the Paper. I certainly think we ought not to ignore the claims of those who have a right to speak upon the subjects raised by the Indian Budget, but, as this was the understanding, I hope the House will now agree to close this debate and proceed with the Orders of the Day.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir John Rolleston*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL.

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Question [10th November], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

*(4.20.) MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): This Bill deals, as its title sets forth, with the Osborne Estate, one of the private estates of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, which under her Will is vested in His Majesty the King for his life, with remainder to the Prince of Wales for his life, with remainder to his first and other sons, according to seniority, in tail general, with divers remainders over, and with an ultimate remainder to His Majesty the King, his heirs and assigns for ever.

The Bill sets out that His Majesty has, with the concurrence of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, signified His gracious pleasure that, on the occasion of his Coronation, the Osborne Estate should be handed over so as to become part of the public property of the Sovereign, and that provision should be made for the use of Osborne House and grounds as a memorial to Her late Majesty Queen Victoria in the manner set forth in the Bill. The Osborne Estate was the personal and private property of the late Queen, and was possessed and transmissible by her as fully and freely, and subject to the laws of England in all material respects as if it were the private property of any of Her Majesty's subjects. However laudable may be, and obviously are, the intentions of the King in varying the will of the late Queen, yet, according to the law of England, the variation is such as it is not within the title and power of His Majesty, even with the concurrence of the Prince of Wales, to effect. According to the preamble of the Bill (which is all the information vouchsafed to this House), the King and the Prince of Wales are but tenants in succession for life; and by the laws of this country they have no more legal rights than is accorded to any of His Majesty's subjects who are similarly vested in property as tenants for life. The first tenant in tail is the eldest son of the Prince of Wales, who is a minor, and cannot of course give consent; and his consent is not alleged in the Bill. Parliament is, therefore, asked to supply the want of title, by giving statutory sanction to the transfer of Osborne Estate proposed in the Bill; upon the footing, as we all know, that Acts of Parliament can cure all defects of title, and sanction anything, even to disinheritance. So far as the wishes of the King are concerned, I feel sure that it would be the desire of every Member of this House to comply with His Majesty's wishes, as far as they could conscientiously do so. But, in this particular case, there are other wishes and interests which this House is equally bound to consider before giving its sanction to this Bill. There are the patrimonial interests of the tenants of tail—the children of the Prince of Wales—which are affected by this Bill, one of the results of the passing of which will be to deprive the Prince of Wales's sons of an inheritance bequeathed to them in tail by their great-grandmother. Then, last, but not least, there are the wishes of the late Queen, as conveyed by her last Will and Testament, regarding the disposal of property which was her own to give and bequeath in whatever terms she pleased; and which, for reasons which were best known to herself, she in the most solemn manner, by her last Will and Testament, bequeathed to be enjoyed as the private estates of the Sovereign. On the Second Reading of this Bill I will not press further the claims of these children of the Prince of Wales. Their interests, if so desired, can be met in Committee by an Amendment limiting the operation of the Bill to the lifetime of His Majesty and the Prince of Wales. But, besides that, what Parliament may do today, Parliament may undo tomorrow; and if any of the tenants in tail who may become King be desirous of resuming Osborne as private estate, in terms of the late Queen's Will, he may, if he so desires, approach the Parliament of the day and ask to be restored against an Act of Parliament to which he was not, and could not be, a consenting party. The main question this House—the last House of Commons elected during the life of her late Majesty—has to consider, is the effect of this Bill on Her Majesty's last wishes. From the terms of the Will itself, it is obvious that the late Queen availed herself of the utmost liberty given to her by law to tie up the estate, by giving two life interests in succession of persons living, and by beginning with the children of the Prince of Wales as the first tenants in tail. That was as far as, in the circumstances, her late Majesty could, under the laws of England, tie up with certainty the Osborne estate.

The Prince of Wales having children alive in her late Majesty's lifetime, no doubt she would picture in her own mind that one day one of these children might come to possess and enjoy Osborne estate as one of the private residences and estates of the Crown, in supplement of whatever Parliament might give to the Privy Purse, and that the estate would continue to be a royal residence in the personal possession of the Sovereign. Again, it was and is a matter of notoriety in this country, that it was the express wish of the late Queen so to tie up the Crown private estates. In this matter of the late Queen's wishes, this House is somewhat at a disadvantage in not having the full text of her Will so far as regards Osborne estate. Notwithstanding the life-rents given to the King and the Prince of Wales, it was within the power of her late Majesty to appoint a *Protector* (not necessarily either of the life-renters), who, during the existence of the life-rent, might give or withhold his consent to any deed by the tenant in tail intended to bar the entail. Whether her late Majesty appointed a *Protector*, or relied solely on the guarding of the entail by the life-renters, this House is not informed.

I protest against this withholding of information. So long as none of the heirs of the late Queen approach this House asking its intervention, this House has nothing to do with Her Majesty's Will. But when Parliament is asked to consent to the breaking of Her Majesty's Will, this House is entitled, before giving its consent, to the fullest information with regard to that Will. But as showing the wishes of her late Majesty as regards the disposal of her private estates, even more striking than the mere terms of the deed itself is the great solicitude which Her Majesty took with regard to the state of the legislation on the subject of Crown private estates, which underwent considerable change during her reign, and all aimed at securing these estates as private property outside of the hereditary estate of the Crown. To go back for a moment to the legislation which preceded the Victorian age. A great authority, Mr. Allen, in his book on the royal prerogative, states that, 1000 years ago, the king of England, like other people, could own and dispose of land as private property. He could also—but only with the assent of his Council—make grants to private persons of the lands which belonged to the people. Gradually, however, this conception changed, and in the last stage the distinction between the private patrimony of the King and the public property of the State was at length obliterated. It became a maxim of English law that all estates possessed by the King—even in his private capacity—belonged to him in right of his Crown, and descended with it to his successor. By the adoption of this principle the king was restrained from making bequests of landed property by Will, but he still retained the power to give away the Crown lands in his lifetime. By an erroneous conception of his right to these lands he was allowed to dispose of them by Patent without the advice and consent of his Great Council. During this period, the Crown lands got dissipated, and led to very great abuses. This state of things was remedied by the Civil List Act of Queen Anne, whereby, in exchange for the Civil List, all private estates of Sovereigns were swept into, and became Crown lands. The Crown was prohibited from holding private property in land, and was also prevented from all alienations of Crown lands The provisions and restrictions of the Act of Anne were further applied by 1 George III., cap. 1, and 34 George III. cap. 75.

It was not until 1800 that the series of Acts begin dealing with the true private estates of the Sovereign. They are enabling Acts, permitting the King to escape from the disabilities of his common law and statutory provisions' and enabling him to acquire, own and dispose of landed property in his own personal right. By 39 and 40 George III., cap. 88, passed in 1880—first and leading although not the last Statute—a distinction was introduced by Statute between the estates held by the Crown, as the Crown, and estates held by the Sovereign in his or her personal capacity. It was enacted that all estates which had been, or which might thereafter be, purchased by His Majesty, his heirs or successors out of any monies issued and applied for the use of the Privy Purse, or with any other monies not appropriated to any public service, were to be possessed and enjoyed as the private patrimony of the Sovereign, free from the restrictions of the Act of Anne. There were further set free from the same restrictions, estates which had come or might come to the Sovereign, his heirs or successors by gift or devise or by descent or otherwise from any of their ancestors or any other person not being kings and queens of this Realm. The reason for this last exemption obviously is that if gifts or succession from kings and queens were not exempted, then pretty well the whole of the Crown property might have fallen under the description of private property of the Sovereign. The next Statute, 4 George IV., cap. 18, passed 1823, extended the private estates of the Sovereign, his heirs and successors, to lands whether freehold, copyhold or leasehold, held directly or through the intervention of trustees before accession to the throne, and which before such accession they might have legally granted, sold or delivered.

We come now to the Statutes in the reign of Queen Victoria, which, taken in conjunction with the Will of the late Queen as regards Osborne Estate, show the great solicitude of Her Majesty that her private estates should be preserved as private property, and not be merged with the Crown Lands, as is proposed by this Bill. The Statute 1 and 2 Vict., cap. 95, Section 4, passed in 1838, extended Section 7 of the Statute of Queen Anne to Ireland and Scotland and to all parts of the United Kingdom. As Her Majesty had valuable private estates in Scotland, and as doubts were raised as to whether the Statute 1 and 2 Vict., cap. 95, so passed, had not extended the Statute of Queen Anne to the private estates of Her Majesty, the Crown Private Estates Act, 1862, was passed, as its title sets forth—

> "To remove doubts concerning, and to amend the law relating to, the private estates of Her Majesty, her heirs and successors."

This Statute was evidently prepared with very great care, and it contains within itself a complete code of laws relating to the private estates of the Sovereign. In Section 1—the interpretation of terms—the private estates of Her Majesty are defined to mean—

> "All real or heritable property and estate of whatever tenure, whether in England, Ireland, or Scotland, or any other part of Her Majesty's dominions, which had been or should thereafter be purchased or acquired by Her Majesty or her heirs and successors out of monies issued and applied for the use of the Privy Purse, or with any other monies not appropriated to any public service, and any lands of whatever tenure which had come, or might come, to her or them by gift, or devise or disposition of, or by descent, inheritance or succession or otherwise from any of her or their ancestors or any person not being king or queen of this realm, and any lands, of whatever tenure, whether in England, Ireland, or Scotland, or any other part of Her Majesty's dominions which did or shall belong to Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, or held in trust for them, at the time of accession, and which before such accession they might have legally granted, sold, given, disposed, or conveyed."

These were practically the terms of the Act of George III. of 1800 as extended by 4 George IV., c. 18 and 1 and 2 Vict., cap. 95, but contained new words specially relating to Scotland—the words dispone and convey. Section 2 of the Act, 1862, goes on to say that none of the provisions and restrictions of the Act of Queen Anne or of 1 George III., cap. 1, or 34 George III., cap. 75, shall extend to the private estates of the Sovereign. By Section 3, leasehold estates (other than in Scotland) are to be vested in trustees. Section 4 deals with estates situate in Scotland. Section 5 deals with testamentary dispositions of the private estates of the Sovereign other than in Scotland, and so applies to the Osborne Estate. It enacts that the private estates of Her Majesty may be disposed of by Her Majesty in manner provided by the 4th Section of 39 and 40 Geo. III., cap. 88—that is the Act of 1800. Provided always that a Will or other testamentary disposition by Her Majesty of and concerning such private estates shall not require publication. The Will is to be valid if signed by the testatrix, or by some other person in her presence and by her direction in the presence of two witnesses. Then follows a proviso that every such Will, whether made under the powers of the Act, 1800 or 1862, shall, as regards the property therein, be construed to speak and take effect as if it had been executed immediately before the death of the testatrix, unless a contrary intention shall appear by the Will. Section 7 of the Act, 1862, applies to Crown Private Estates the provisions of Section 5 of 39 and 40 Geo. III., cap. 88, which provides that if no disposition of such estates is made by the Sovereign, or if the disposition does not exhaust the whole estate then the same or the balance is to descend as if that Act had not been passed—the effect of which would be to carry it to the Crown property. As showing Her Majesty's solicitude regarding her private estates, and that they should be treated in all respects as the private estates of any of her subjects, Section 8 prescribes that the private estates of the Sovereign shall be subject to all such taxes, rates, duties, assessments and impositions, parliamentary and parochial, as the same would have been subject to if they had been the property of any subject of the realm; and all such rates and taxes shall, so long as such private estates shall be vested in Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, be ascertained, rated, assessed, or imposed thereon in the same manner and form in all respects as if the same estates were the absolute and beneficial estate of any of Her Majesty's subjects. By Section 9, payment is to be made out of the Privy Purse of Her Majesty [to save proceedings against the estate.]

Although the Act of 1862 was framed with very great care and was an Act to remove doubts concerning the law relating to Crown private estates, yet so solicitous was Her late Majesty regarding her private estates, if left to one who might succeed her as King, that another Act was passed in 1873, 36 & 37 Vict., cap. 61—to explain and amend the Crown Private Estates Act, 1862, and to remove doubts as to whether any such private estates left to one who may be or become King or Queen of this realm, will be, or, after accession, continue to be, held as private estates. It will have been observed that the previous Acts only allowed to be treated as private estates, gifts or descent where the donor or ancestor was not a King or Queen of this realm. Section 1 of the Act of 1873 enacts that all the provisions of the Act of 1862 concerning the private estates of Her Majesty shall apply to all gifts, devises, or dispositions made by Her Majesty, her heirs or successors to any person who may become King or Queen of this realm, unless in the instrument an intention shall be expressed that such estates shall not be, or after the accession of any person entitled thereto to the Crown of this realm, continue to be, held as such private estate.

Nothing could be more emphatic regarding Her Majesty's intention. But there is even more in this Act of 1873. It extends to the Crown private estates the provisions of Section 3 of 3rd and 4th William IV., cap. 106, passed in 1833, which provides that when any land has been devised by any testator to the heir or to the person who shall be heir of such testator, such heir shall be considered to have acquired the land as a devise and not by descent. Before the passing of the Act of 1833, if any person devised lands to his heir by Will, then, on the death of the testator, the heir took the lands as heir, and not as devisee. It is a well-known principle of construction of statutes that unless an Act of Parliament is made specially to apply to the Crown, the Crown is not affected by t. Hence, as the Act of 1833 did not specially apply to the inheritances of the Crown, they were excluded from its operation. The result was that estates left to the heir of the Crown by the Sovereign would be taken up not as devisee under the will but as heir to the Crown; and thus the lands would fall into the hereditary estate of the Crown, which by the statute of Anne could not be alienated. Hence the necessity of Section 2 of the Act of 1873, which preserved the private character of any estate devised by the Queen to the heir of the throne.

It was, therefore, in order to prevent the very thing happening that this Bill proposes to do—namely, the falling of Crown private estates into the hereditary estate of the Crown—that the Acts of 1862 and 1873 were passed Even this change was not allowed to be passed unchallenged. In the division on the Second Reading, 167 voted for the Bill, and 35 against it—the tellers against being Mr. George Anderson, one of the Members for Glasgow, and Mr. Bouverie, the Member for Kilmarnock Burghs. The minority were opposed to giving any facilities for the acquisition of private property by the Sovereign, holding that it should all be merged in the Crown lands. The opinion of Sir George Lewis was quoted in the debate, who on 22nd May, 1857, said:—

> "It has been deemed a matter of policy in this country wholly to strip and denude the Sovereign of all hereditary property, and to render him during his life entirely dependent upon the bounty of Parliament."

In the course of the Debate in 1873, Mr. Gladstone—who was then Prime Minister—incidentally referred to the case of the Osborne estates. He said:—

> "If Osborne were to fall into the mass of Crown Estates—[the effect of this Bill]—it would have to be taken under the charge of the Commissioner of Works—[what this Bill proposes to do]—and this House would be asked for a large sum of money for its maintenance as a Royal residence—[the purpose of this Bill]. It appeared to him that these outlying properties were of secondary importance, of no territorial importance whatever, and that it was for the interest of the public, considered in a pounds, shillings, and pence view of the question, that they should not become part of the Crown estates."

Obviously, the whole of the debate would be followed by Her late Majesty with the greatest interest, and would increase her determination to preserve the private character of her estates, with the view of preventing their becoming part of the Crown lands.

Now if we turn for a moment to the Bill itself we shall find that it is not intended to confer a gift, as it were, on the part of the King to the nation. I have already dealt with the King's title. It is important to observe what the Bill does. It transfers Osborne estate and vests it in His Majesty in right of the Crown, and henceforth it is to cease to be a private estate of the Sovereign. Then provision is made for keeping it up by placing it as a charge on the public revenues of the country, and the Crown Lands Act is to apply. While this property is ostensibly handed over and becomes part of the Crown lands, it should be observed that under the pro-restriction. By sub-Section 4 of Section visions of the Bill it is handed over with a 1 it is proposed that the Osborne estate should become a memorial of Her late Majesty. The sub-Section provides—

> "As a memorial to Her late Majesty, the Commissioners of Works (*a*) Shall, during His Majesty's pleasure, preserve, so far as may be in its present condition, and keep open to the public, in such manner and on such terms as the Commissioners, with the approval of His Majesty, determine, such part of Osborne House as appears to have been in the personal occupation of Her late Majesty; and (*b*) shall devote the rest of Osborne House and the grounds under their management to be used for the benefit of officers of His Majesty's naval and military forces or their wives, widows or family. And the Commissioners of Works shall allow the said part of the estate coloured yellow (being Barton House and grounds) to be used as a residence for such persons as they may determine with the approval of His Majesty."

This is not a gift to the nation. It is really a new trust not to be enjoyed by the nation as a whole, but by a section, "officers of His Majesty's naval and military forces, or their wives, widows, or family." The only thing the nation, as a whole, is to have is the privilege of paying the money for the up-keep of the estate and adapting Osborne House for the occupation by naval and military officers. I think that the matter will require to be very carefully considered in Committee. I take the position that we are dealing here with a property which, but for this Bill, the King and the Prince of Wales have not the power, according to the law of this country, to dispose of, in view of the Will of the late Queen. I think I have shown that Her Majesty was particularly solicitous that her private estates should not be merged in the Crown lands. I do not, of course, intend to move any Amendment now, but I have thought it right to bring this matter before the House. I think also, perhaps, I have given a complexion to the matter which even the King himself had not present to his mind. He probably thought when he was dealing with the estate that it was one over which he had full control. The matter can be dealt with in Committee. The transfer of the estate as the King wishes may be made so far as his life extends, or it may be so far as the lives of the King and the Prince of Wales extend, but I think if Parliament does that it will do everything that is competent at present.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): May I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will tell the House what will be the financial aspects of the proposals in the Bill?

*(4.58.) THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I do not think any one can complain of the hon. Gentleman opposite for having drawn attention to the circumstances under which this Bill is proposed, and, if I may say so, I compliment the hon. Gentleman on the extraordinary power of research he has exhibited, and the lucid manner in which he has given to the House the result of his researches. But I think it will be unnecessary for me, and the hon. Gentleman will hardly expect me, to enter into all the various points he has raised, and the legal points he has so ably discussed, and to explore with him all the various statutes which have a bearing on the matter, and with regard to which we are not asking the House to come to a decision today. The hon. Gentleman did say something which I feel bound to remark upon for one moment. He rather accused the Government of concealing the contents of Her late Majesty's Will, and of withholding information which might perhaps have led the House to take a different view of the Bill from that which it would otherwise have taken.

*MR. CALDWELL: Perhaps I may be allowed to say that I had no intention of accusing the Government of deliberately concealing anything.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am making no accusation against the hon. Gentleman. I only wanted to make it clear that, although we had not had it in our power to give the hon. Gentleman a copy of the will as he asked me to do on a recent occasion, yet the effect of Her late Majesty's Will is, of course, fully described in the preamble of the Bill. We do not for a moment wish to deny that this Bill is a variation of the wishes and Will of Her Majesty the late Queen. If it had not been so, it would not have been necessary for us to come to the House for some sections of this Bill. The hon. Gentleman does not deny that so far as the rights which the King, and the Prince of Wales had under Her late Majesty's Will are concerned, they were perfectly at liberty to place these rights at the disposal of Parliament, and, if I might be allowed to say so, I think the country at large will consider that, in doing this, the King and the Prince of Wales have made a munificent and generous gift to the nation. It is not only a gift of very great value at the present time, but a gift which will be, I venture to say, of much greater value in the future; for any one who has acquaintance with the extent and the nature of the land which has been conveyed to the nation will know that there are immense possibilities of development in the future, and that the gift of the King and the Prince of Wales is a most munificent one. With regard to the rights of the young Prince, there is no doubt that what the hon. Gentleman said is true; that he has rights under the Will which he is not in a position himself to dispose of. But, if this gift was to be made in a way in which it could be availed of by the country, it was necessary that all existing rights should be dealt with under the Bill. The hon. Gentleman himself has really given up any question of the rights of the young Prince by saying that these can dealt with in Committee. So far as the King and the Prince of Wales are concerned, in it will be recognised by the country that they are giving up to the country something of very great value. The hon. Gentleman has rather thrown some doubt on that by saying that this estate is not really to be for the enjoyment of the public, but for a select portion of the public. It is perfectly true that so far as the greater portion of Osborne House is concerned, the intentions of His Majesty are expressed in the fourth sub-Section of Clause 1, which reads as follows—

> "That the House will be preserved in its present condition, and kept open. . . . and used for the benefit of officers of His Majesty's Naval and Military forces, or their wives, widows, or families."

Well, in order to carry out His Majesty's desires, and in the general interest of the public, and also in the interest of those who, as His Majesty's advisers think, should be specially favoured in this matter, a Committee has been appointed and is now sitting; and although they have not yet finally settled the exact form in which the intention of His Majesty is to be carried out, I hope that their Report will very soon be in my hands. The House will see, I think, from the composition of that Committee, that all interests are adequately represented upon it. Lord Esher and Sir Dighton Probyn may be taken to represent the official part of the Committee; Sir F. Treves and Sir Francis Laking will be, I think, accepted as representing the medical side of the case; Sir E. Ward, the permanent Secretary to the War Office, represents the Army, Captain Tyrwhitt represents the Navy, Sir E. Hamilton safeguards the Treasury, Sir Schomberg McDonnell represents the Office of Works, and Mr. Horner the Office of Woods. I think that that Committee will be accepted by the House as a representative Committee; and I am quite sure that any recommendations which they may make in regard to the mode in which the wishes of His Majesty are to be carried out will command the confidence of the House. I may say here that that portion of Osborne House in which her late Majesty died will not be open to the public at all, as it is the desire that that portion shall be kept, if I may say so, somewhat more sacred than the other parts of the house. But the grounds will be open to the general public.

*Mr. CALDWELL: That is not what the Bill says.

*Mr. RITCHIE: That is the understanding. The gardens, of course, will be only available to those who are living in the house—the officers of the Army and the Navy, their wives, widows, and families, who may ultimately find refuge there. As to the cost to the public, I may say that it has been estimated that the structural alterations will cost between £5,000 and £6,000, and the up-keep of the house, gardens, and grounds, everything included, will come to between £3,000 and £5,000 a year, according to the manner in which the house is utilised. Then there are the stables. Any one who has had the privilege of seeing the estate of Osborne will know that these stables are an extremely fine range of buildings, and the House will be glad to know that they are to be utilised in a manner which I am sure will be satisfactory to the House and to the public at large. The First Lord of the Admiralty has under his consideration a proposal to station a training ship in Osborne Bay for the use of naval cadets, and the stable buildings will be fitted up as workshops, gymnasia, and drill rooms for the cadets on board this ship. The existing dormitories will be utilised for the naval attendants, who will be required to look after the premises. There is also to be a sanatorium for the use of the naval cadets I feel sure that the House will agree with me, that that is a very useful way in which to utilise the stables.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: What about the cost of the naval arrangement?

*MR. RITCHIE: They will be charged in the Navy Estimates. There is at present an amount, roughly speaking, of £1,000 coming in from rents on the estate, so that the yearly expenditure will be reduced by that amount.

MR. CALDWELL: What will the rates be?

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not know, but I imagine that they will be small. I have explained all the circumstances under which this Bill has been proposed, and I think that the proposals contained in the Bill are of a nature which will be acceptable to the public, and that the House and the country will consider that the King and the Prince of Wales, in making over to the public this most valuable estate, have acted in a most generous manner. I hope in these circumstances that there will be no dispute as to the Second Reading of the Bill, which will have to be referred to a Select Committee.

*MR. GIBSON-BOWLES (Lynn Regis): A stranger instance of the mutability of human affairs has never been presented than this—that within two years of the death of our revered Sovereign, a Minister should stand up and propose to the House, a variation of the wishes and Will of Her late Majesty. Those are his own very words. I think that if three years ago such a suggestion had been made, it would have been scouted, not only by Ministers, the House, and the people of Great Britain, but even by the entire world. as an impossibility. But I desire to ask some information as to the real effect of the changes that are proposed to be made. For instance, we are told that that portion of Osborne House which was in the personal occupation of Her late Majesty is to be kept sacred, and that the public are not to be admitted to it. Well, the phrase, "personal occupation of Her Majesty," has usually been applied to a whole palace, such as Windsor and Buckingham Palace, personally occupied by the Sovereign. What does it mean here? We have not been told what part of Osborne House is regarded as having been in the personal occupation of Her late Majesty. Are the State rooms, and all the rest of the house where the guests were lodged, to be closed to the public?

*MR. RITCHIE: I have stated that that portion of the House in which the late Queen died will not be open to the public at all. The State apartments, including the large Indian Durbar room, will be open to the public.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am much obliged for the right hon. Gentleman's explanation. The right hon. Gentleman has described the composition of the Committee which is to consider, so far as I understand, the manner in which the Osborne estate is to be disposed of in order to carry out the provisions of this Bill. That Committee contains officials, medical representatives, naval and military officers, representatives of the Treasury and of the Office of Works; but there is no suggestion, so far as I can see, to put upon it any single representative of the public. Surely the public have some right to be considered in this matter, when we are asked to put down £6,000 at once for structural alterations, and to pay £5,000 a year for maintaining the estate. I should have thought that, on a Committee so large, two members, either of this House or in some other way representing the public, should have been added to the Committee.

*MR. RITCHIE: Perhaps I ought to have stated that I propose that the Report of that Committee shall be laid before the House before the Bill leaves the House.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): Before the Committee stage?

*MR. RITCHIE: I hope that may be possible.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I should have preferred that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee rather than to a picked Committee.

*MR. RITCHIE: The Bill will be referred to a Select Committee.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then there will be a Select Committee of the House on the Bill as well as this executive Committee?

*MR. RITCHIE: "Executive Committee" is not the proper term to apply to the Committee I have named. It is a Committee which has been appointed with a view to advising as to the best manner in which the King's wishes can be carried out.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand that this Committee will make its Report, and there end its functions?

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It will not be a permanent Committee?

*MR. RITCHIE: Certainly not.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am glad to have elicited that information, which is entirely satisfactory. There is one other point. The right hon. Gentleman has explained that there is to be a new cadet training ship anchored in Osborne Bay. If this is to be a new training ship for cadets, is it to be a "Britannia" in little?

*MR. RITCHIE: I am not in a position to explain to the hon. Gentleman, or to the House, exactly what the ship will be, or what it is going to do. I have explained what is to be done with the stables, and in doing so I incidentally stated that it was proposed to station a cadet training ship in Osborne Bay.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It now appears that the Navy is to be put in the stables, and that, in order to justify that, a naval cadets' training-ship is to be put into Osborne Bay at a further expense in the Navy estimates. It is only recently that we have very much enlarged the grounds at Dartmouth and erected magnificent buildings for the naval cadets there. To set up a supplementary establishment at Osborne seems unwise. I believe that it will be extremely difficult to provide at Osborne, notwithstanding the stables, the accommodation which will be absolutely necessary for training cadets. I trust that when the Bill is before the Select Committee further information will be given. There is another point. I followed with great interest the somewhat long, but very excellent, speech of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark, and I must say that the strongest part of that speech was that in which he complained that the rights of the young Prince were set aside. It is impossible to conceal the fact that this Bill deprives the young Prince of his patrimony. I always understood that this House, and especially the Party to which I belong, was very tender as to the rights of property; and that if there was greater jealousy to be observed in one case than another, it should be in the case of the rights of private property of the Sovereign. The right hon. Gentleman has not defended the deprivation of the rights of the young Prince. He only says that it is necessary that these rights should be dealt with in order that this Bill should be passed. I do not think that that is a sufficient reason for depriving the young Prince of his patrimony. I could have wished that some better or more complete justification had been made for it. We must all feel gratitude for the munificence of the King and the Prince of Wales, who have placed their interests at the disposal of the country, but I think the account which the right hon. Gentleman has given of the purposes to which the estate is to be put is incomplete. I can only hope that Osborne House will be preserved and looked upon with veneration as a great memorial of the great Queen whose Will it is now proposed to set aside.

MR. YOXALL: There is no doubt that this is a magnificent gift which His Majesty has made to the country; and I cannot imagine that anyone would object to it, though there are one or two points of detail on which further information is desirable. I think, however, that before the House proceeds with the Bill, which will lay an annual charge on the nation for all time, we should have the Report of the Advisory Committee to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has referred. We ought to know on what terms the naval and military officers are to be admitted to Osborne House; how many of them there are to be; and what the age of admission and what the process of selection are to be; although, of course, such questions could not be raised in regard to Hampton Court, which is entirely at the disposal of His Majesty.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N. E.): This is an occasion on which we would not be inclined to make use of fulsome expressions about Royalty. I am of an age to be without ambition, but I deprecate the use of language of the kind with which my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn commenced his speech. Her late Majesty left to her family this magnificent property, purchased out of her private means, and Her Majesty's immediate descendants have desired to turn that property to the use of the nation, and have bestowed it in the manner of which we have heard today. I think we should all wish that the property left to Her Majesty's descendants should be used by them according to their judgment. I do not wish to associate myself with any expression implying that His Majesty is doing otherwise than making a noble and beneficial use of the property settled upon him and his family by his revered mother.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, that all Petitions against the Bill presented three clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, that the Committee have power to send for persons, Papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Hayes-Fisher.*)

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 24th November, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES (GENERAL) (PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL REPRESENTATION OF TRADING COMPANIES IN THE COLONIES UNDER RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.)

Circular Despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th December, 1901, and the reply of the Commonwealth of Australia thereto.

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.

Financial Statements for 1900–1901 and 1901–1902, and Estimates for 1901–1902 and 1902–1903.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Two Orders in Council of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern and Southern Nigeria respectively.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Two Orders in Council of the 19th November, 1902: (1) Making rules for preventing collisions by vessels navigating Lake Windermere; and (2) Confirming pilotage bye-laws made by the Limerick Harbour Commissioners.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.

Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902 authorising an alteration in the scale of salaries of assistant masters, Royal Hospital School (Nautical Division), Greenwich.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON.)

Orders made by the County Council of the county of Southampton, altering certain polling districts in the Southern or Fareham and the New Forest Divisions of the county.

PUBLIC RECORDS (WAR OFFICE).

Seventh schedule, containing a list and particulars of classes of documents existing or accruing in the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31st MARCH, 1902).

Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the money expended and borrowed, and securities created, under the said Act to the 31st March, 1902.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHS).

Account showing the gross amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1902, and the balance of the expenditure over the receipts, and statement additional to the above account.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Leave given to the Lord Welby to attend the Select Committee of the House of Commons pursuant to Message of Thursday last, if he think fit, and his Lordship consenting thereto, a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) (No. 2) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to order): Committee negatived: Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order) and dispensed with Bill read 3^a: and passed.

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I have given private notice to the noble Duke of a Question which I wish to ask him with regard to the Brussels Convention. It is, whether it is the intention of the Government to give this House an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the Sugar Bounties Convention before the same is ratified by the Crown. I do not propose tonight to state at length the reasons why I and other friends of mine are opposed to this Convention, but I do contend that your Lordships' House has the same right to express an opinion on the Convention as the other House of Parliament. No doubt it may be said there is a treaty to be ratified, and that a Bill will have to be introduced which will reach this House, but I hold that your Lordships have an equal right with the other House to express its views before ratification. Otherwise your Lordships will be placed in an embarrassed and undignified position. No doubt this Convention has peculiarities about it, and the form in which the motion is being made in another place could not be made here. At the same time, I do assert that on the general question, without pledging the House to any particular action with regard to the financial part, this House has an equal right with the other House to express its opinion.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, the answer to the Question of the noble Earl is that His Majesty's Government, as at present advised, do not propose to submit a resolution in this House similar to that which has been moved to-day in the House of Commons. The procedure which has been adopted in the other House has, perhaps, no exact precedent to recommend it, but I believe that the circumstances themselves are to a great extent also unprecedented. It was considered most desirable to show to the other Powers concerned that His Majesty's Government were in earnest in their intention to adopt such measures as might be necessary in order to carry into effect the Convention to which they had agreed. The most regular form in which this could have been done would have been to pass through Parliament the necessary measure for carrying out the Convention before the date of ratification—namely, 1st February next; but, owing to pressure of business in Parliament, this course was not found possible, and, therefore, it was decided to proceed by Resolution. But as the Bill which will eventually have to be passed through Parliament will deal mainly with financial matters, it was not considered necessary or desirable to submit a similar Resolution in this House. A Bill will, in any case, be necessary, and, as the noble Earl has stated, it will be possible for your Lordships to discuss the provisions contained in the Bill. The noble Earl, however, as I understand, desires that this House should have some opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the Convention before its ratification. For the reason I have stated, His Majesty's Government do not propose to invite this House to give such an expression of opinion. But I must point out that the Convention itself, and the correspondence relating to it, are in the hands of noble Lords, and, if they desire to raise any discussion upon it, it is perfectly competent for them to take that course.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I am afraid we cannot consider that the answer given by the noble Duke meets the necessities of the present position. It does seem to me an extraordinary thing that it should be a Ministry belonging to the Party which calls itself the Constitutional Party which thus refrains from bringing before the House of Lords for sanction an arrangement of the importance of the Brussels Convention. My noble friend the Leader of the Opposition has explained, I think very clearly, the great difficulty that this House will be in if it is invited to discuss this subject only on the Bill which is to be brought in at some future period. Then we shall be discussing the subject, so to speak, with our hands tied. The noble Duke has said that the object of bringing forward this Resolution in another place was to show to the other Powers that the Government were in earnest in their desire to see this Convention completed. It seems to me that we in this House have an equal right to be asked to express our opinion on the subject. I think the Government should, out of respect to this House, have invited your Lordships to agree to their proposal. I do not think that it is altogether consonant with the dignity of this House to ask that an important subject of this kind should be left in the hands of a private Member to initiate and to deal with. I, like my noble friend, do not intend to go into the merits of the question, but undoubtedly the Convention does raise most important points. It raises the question whether bounties really are advantageous or whether they are not; it raises the whole question of the future position of this country in reference to its financial arrangements with regard to trade; and it raises the great constitutional question how far we are right in giving a Commission, largely composed of the representatives of foreign powers, the right to criticise, and even impose conditions on, our finance. It has been urged by the noble Duke that the matter is a financial one; but, while it is quite true that we in this House are constitutionally forbidden to amend a money Bill, we have a right to reject a money Bill, which shows, I think, that we have complete control over financial matters, at any rate to the extent of saying aye or no. I hope that the Government may yet reconsider their decision, and that from the Front Bench opposite some Motion will be moved inviting this House to agree with the proposals of His Majesty's Government.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I do not differ at all from what has been said by the noble Lord opposite as to the great importance of the Brussels Convention. It involves many important and far-reaching principles, and no subject would probably be more worthy of discussion in your Lordships' House. I do not, however, consider that we are open to the charge of having in any sense withdrawn the matter from the cognizance of your Lordships. So far as the question of form and procedure is concerned, the noble Duke behind me has, I think, made it clear that the Resolution now before the House of Commons is not one which your Lordships' House could conveniently be expected to discuss. Then arises the question, have we in any sense cheated the House of Lords out of an opportunity of fully debating and examining this question? The Report of the Brussels Convention was laid before Parliament in the month of March of this year. There has been nothing surreptitious about it. The facts had been fully disclosed, Papers had been laid before Parliament containing a full account of the instructions given to our delegates at Brussels, and, so far as I am aware, on no single occasion has any noble Lord on the Bench opposite indicated an active interest in the matter. The noble Earl might upon any evening during the summer have brought down the President of the Cobden Club and asked us to discuss the economical questions raised by the Brussels Convention, but nothing of the kind was done. Even now it is perfectly open to any one of your Lordships to raise the question of the policy adopted by His Majesty's Government in going into conference at Brussels. I do not know whether that is likely to be done or not, but to this charge, at any rate, I do not think we are open, that we have in any sense shown a want of respect to your Lordships by not inviting you to consider our policy in regard to the question.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, this is a very short Bill, which was introduced at the request of the Royal Dublin Society and passed through the other House without opposition. The object of the Bill is to transfer the administration of a sum of £5,000—being part of the sums paid in respect of the Probate Duty Grant to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account—expended annually for the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle in Ireland, from the Royal Dublin Society to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland. This will prevent a considerable amount of overlapping which now takes place in the distribution of two grants of public money for the same purpose by two different Departments.

Bill read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday the 4th of December next.

ERRORS OF SEXTANTS.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of the House to the means that are generally adopted for ascertaining the errors of sextants both in the Royal Navy and in the Mercantile Marine; and to ask the First

Lord of the Admiralty if there is any probability of his causing a table of angular star distances to be published for the purpose of facilitating the necessary calculations as described in an article which appeared in the September number of the *Nautical Magazine* of 1901. This matter may appear somewhat technical, but there are several Members of your Lordships' House who have had sea experience, and others who are in the habit of assisting in the navigation of their own yachts, and they, at any rate, will have no difficulty in understanding the subject. It is almost needless to remark that the supposed position of a ship at sea, when out of sight of land and out of soundings, depends entirely upon observation taken by a sextant, whose error ought to be correctly known. The calculations for ascertaining some of these components are very simple, while others are very complicated. The index error can easily be found. It is the centring error that baffles the mariner. So much so, that Captain Lecky, the well-known writer on navigation, has declared that—

> "To test the centring errors is practically beyond the power of the navigator."

It is customary, in consequence, to send sextants to be corrected for centring and other errors to Kew Observatory, where special apparatus has been erected for that purpose. But it is a far cry from China to Kew, and if a sextant gets out of order on a far distant station, or meets with an accident, an occurrence which is not uncommon, the ship herself is very likely to meet with another accident on her way home, for she has to be brought back by a faulty sextant and thereby runs considerable risks.

I have, however, been fortunate enough to hit upon a method for finding the total error of a sextant which is simplicity itself, and which I published in the *Nautical Magazine* for September, 1901. By taking the angular distance between two stars, when they are in a line, or nearly in a line with the zenith—that is, in other words, on the same great circle of altitude—and then applying the corrections due to refraction, a true observed distance is obtained. The difference between this and the calculated distance is the total error for that particular angle. If the real or calculated angle is already known, the error can in this manner be found in less than a couple of minutes. I am desirous of seeing a table of these calculated distances published in the Nautical Almanack. I am aware that all the executive officers of the Royal Navy, and many of those belonging to first-class lines of mail steamers, are capable of making this calculation for themselves. There is, however, no reason why their time should be wasted in calculating and recalculating the fixed distance of fixed stars when they have other duties to attend to. These calculations would be much better done once for all by a single computer on dry land. As, however, some stars have an appreciable movement, this work would require revision about once in five years. But by far the larger portion of the tonnage of Great Britain is in the charge of men who have not much knowledge of nautical astronomy, and who have possibly never made a logarithmic computation to seconds of arc in the course of their existence. The sextants they use are often cheap and secondhand. But though their sextants are cheap, the lives of these men are of value, and so also are the lives of the men under their command; and it is principally in their interests that I am asking the noble Earl at the head of the Admiralty to make this addition to the Nautical Almanack. It would be a boon to mariners to publish it, and it would be one of those boons that do not consist of robbing Peter to pay Paul. With the permission of the House, I will quote an extract from an article recently written by Mr. H. B. Goodwin, who was at one time Naval Instructor at the Royal Naval College at Greenwich. Mr. Goodwin wrote—

> "To give an idea of the magnitude of the errors to which the sextant is liable, we may mention the result of thirty years' experience at the Kew Observatory, taken from a report made to the British Association at its meeting at Aberdeen in 1885. For errors in centring and defects in graduation, 20 per cent. of the instruments gave half a minute of error, 30 per cent. gave one minute, 25 per cent. gave two minutes, and 7 per cent. reached three minutes."

Now, a minute of angle is one sea mile at the surface of the globe. In Staff-Commander Martin's work on "Navigation," a sextant is referred to which had a centring error which varied from nothing to ten minutes. Many years ago the late Admiral Sir Charles Shadwell, under whom I had at one time the honour of serving, and from whom I learnt much, published a little book that contained a table which gave the angular distances of twenty-seven pairs of stars. The last edition came out in 1870, and is therefore more than thirty years old. These pairs of stars were, however, not selected with the view of correcting sextants, but for the purpose of shortening the calculations for obtaining the latitude by a method that has now become obsolete. The principle on which these pairs of stars should be chosen, is that the seaman should have the opportunity of correcting his sextant at about every 15 degrees of arc. Different pairs of stars should be selected for different zones of latitude, and the seaman should be able to correct his sextant for all angles during the first and middle watches of two consecutive starlight nights, at any time of the year and at any place on the globe, except, of course, in high latitudes in summer time when stars cannot be seen. I would suggest that this table be published separately at first, and afterwards as part of the Nautical Almanack.

To sum up, I suggest that the seaman should take the angular distance of a pair of stars in line with the zenith, apply the error due to refraction, and then take the difference between the observed angle and the one in the Admiralty table. That will be the total error of his sextant, which is what he wants. I wish to enable every navigator to find the error of his own sextant while on board his own ship, instead of running the risk of being drowned while on his way to Kew to find it out. I do not wish it to be understood that I am saying anything disrespectful to the Kew Observatory. I look upon it as one of the most valuable institutions that the country possesses, and whether this table is published or not, I think that a man is unwise who purchases a sextant that does not possess a Kew certificate. I now beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty the question of which I have given notice.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I am afraid I am at this great disadvantage, that I have none of the personal knowledge of this very scientific question which the noble Lord himself possesses. All I can do is to give him and the House the opinion of the expert advisers of the Admiralty and the Board of Trade on the point that he has brought to your Lordships' notice. I am advised that nearly all the errors of the sextant can be readily ascertained by an ordinary observer without any difficulty. The only errors that cannot be so ascertained are due to false centring or graduation. These are usually supplied with a good sextant after it has been tested at Kew Observatory, but they are usually so small that it is unnecessary to consider them in ordinary navigation. When very accurate positions are required, these can be obtained by observing celestial objects on each side of the zenith at, or about, the same altitude. This not only eliminates all sextant errors, but also those due to refraction of the horizon, a much more important matter. It is not, therefore, considered necessary to calculate angular distances between stars, or to publish tables, which would never be absolutely correct owing to the differences in the refraction at different altitudes. I am afraid that the answer does not correspond to the noble Lord's views, but the opinions it contains are those of the experts, not only of the Admiralty but of the Board of Trade.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: It scarcely corresponds with the facts that I have quoted.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order); further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

House adjourned at five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS).

Return ordered, "showing comparison between ships with Scotch Boilers and those fitted with Water-tube Boilers, in the following form :—

Ships fitted with Scotch Boilers.

Class and name of Ship.			Date of first commission	Period actually in commission.	Total cost incurred for alterations and additions since first commission.			Total cost incurred for alterations, additions and repairs since first commission.		
					Engines.	Boilers.	Total.	Engines.	Boilers.	Total.
	Tons.	I.H.P.								

Ships fitted with Water-tube Boilers.

Class and name of Ship.			Date of first commission.	Period actually in commission.	Total cost incurred for alterations and additions since first commission.			Total cost incurred for alterations, additions and repairs since first commission.		
					Engines.	Boilers.	Total.	Engines.	Boilers.	Total.
	Tons.	I.H.P.								

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 356, of Session 1902, and to include all Ships and Classes included therein)."—(*Lord Charles Beresford.*)

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.

Copy presented, of Financial Statements for 1900–1901 and 1901–02, and Estimates for 1901–02 and 1902–03 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON).

Copies presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the County of Southampton altering certain polling districts in the Southern or Fareham and the New Forest Divisions of the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

Account presented, showing the gross Amount received and expended on account of the telegraph service during the year ended 31st March, 1902, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 379.]

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of The Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the money expended and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act to the 31st March, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 380.]

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council, of the 19th November, 1902, regulating the currency of Northern and Southern Nigeria respectively [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council, of the 19th November, 1902 (i.) making rules for preventing collisions by vessels navigating Lake Windermere; and (ii.) confirming pilotage bye-laws made by the Limerick Harbour Commissioners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 19th November, 1902, authorising an alteration in the scale of salaries of assistant masters, Royal Hospital School (Nautical Division), Greenwich [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKHOUSE NURSING.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the nursing of the sick poor in the workhouses. Part I. Report and Summary of Recommendations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKHOUSE NURSING.

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the Nursing of the Sick Poor in Workhouses, together with Appendix and Index to Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House:

PUBLIC RECORDS (WAR OFFICE).

Copy of Seventh Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents existing or accruing in the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department, which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Port Sanitary Authorities.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to a letter addressed to the Local Government Board by the Association of Port Sanitary Authorities on 19th November, 1901, requesting them to issue an Order applying the provisions of The Public Health and Local Government Conferences Act, 1885, to the various Port Sanitary Authorities, so as to give them power to apply their funds in paying expenses incidental to attending meetings of the Association of Port Sanitary Authorities; and will he say why no answer has been as yet given to this communication, and what course the Local Government Board propose to adopt in regard to the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I do not find that I have received the letter referred to, but representations have been made to me as to the issue of an Order applying the Act mentioned in the Question to port sanitary authorities. Legislation would, however, be necessary to enable me to issue an Order for this purpose, and the point has been noted for consideration when an opportunity for legislation arises.

Committee on Workhouse Accounts.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Committee appointed in May, 1901, to inquire and report in respect of the keeping of workhouse accounts, and of simplifying the necessary records, has completed its Report; whether he is aware that boards of guardians have been for a long time expecting some modification in the present system of workhouse accounts, and are inconvenienced in placing their stationery orders by the delay in the publication of the Report; and whether he can take steps to hasten the completion of the Report of the Committee, and ensure the speedy issue of an Order dealing with the question.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Report of the Committee referred to has been made to me, and the matter is at present under my consideration. I hope to be able to communicate with boards of guardians on the subject at no distant date.

Ranelagh Place Post Office, Liverpool—Alleged Insanitary Condition.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been directed to the insanitary conditions under which the staff employed at the Ranelagh Place Post Office, Liverpool, have to perform their work; and if he will state what steps are being taken to remedy the alleged grievance.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The branch post office in Ranelagh Place, Liverpool, has been examined more than once in reference to allegations of insanitary conditions existing in the premises, and I am assured that there is no good ground for them. The lease will expire next year, and inquiries are being made as to what improvements can then be effected.

Promotions amongst Liverpool Telegraphists.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that there are now fifty telegraphists at Liverpool who have reached their maximum salary; and whether, seeing that since 1871 only three postmasterships and an equal number of sub-postmasterships have been given to officers attached to the telegraph establishment at that office, he will give favourable consideration to any applications which may be received for vacancies, and, with a view to hastening promotion, refuse extensions of service to officers who have qualified for the maximum pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware of the circumstances at Liverpool, which are substantially as the hon. Member describes them; and, as regards applications for vacant postmasterships and sub-postmasterships, I need hardly say that I shall continue the practice of my predecessor in giving them full consideration. But I should not feel justified in accelerating the retirement of efficient officers solely in order to create vacancies for others.

Dublin Postal Officials.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that in Dublin sorting clerks and telegraphists, the majority of whom are between the ages of seventeen and twenty years, are compelled to carry baskets filled with newspapers and book-packets, and that some of the baskets weigh more than a stone when empty; and whether, seeing that the weight limit which a postman on collection is compelled to carry is 28 lbs., and that when these receptacles mentioned are full they weigh at least double this, he will take steps to provide that the duty devolves upon men better fitted for the work.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Arrangements were made in August last for relieving the sorting clerks in Dublin of certain work proper to postmen, and I am not aware that anything more is required. I will have further inquiry made, however, on the point raised by the hon. Member.

Dublin Post Office—Clerical Staff.

Mr. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that it was stated at the Tweedmouth Commission that a scheme was about to be brought into operation by which the clerical force in the secretary's and accountant's offices in Dublin would be recruited from the ranks of the sorting clerks and telegraphists in Dublin by means of competitive examination amongst the staff; and can he explain why this promise has not been fulfilled, and whether the Department has any intention of putting this scheme into operation in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that it was stated in evidence before the Tweedmouth Committee that, as part of a larger scheme, it was proposed that the clerical force in the secretary's and accountant's offices in Dublin should be recruited by competition among persons already in the Post Office service, but it was not proposed to limit the competition to Dublin candidates only. I may state that, although the adoption of this part of the scheme was not proceeded with, Dublin sorting clerks and telegraphists between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six, if of good conduct and character, are eligible, in common with other officers of this Department, to compete for clerkships in several of the London offices.

South Africa—Permit Regulations—Oath of Allegiance—Case of M. du Toit.

MR. HENRY J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, while some late prisoners of war at Cape Town have been permitted to make the declaration referred to in his interview with the Boer Generals on the 5th September last, some other late prisoners, including M. du Toit, ex-Captain of Transvaal Artillery, have been refused by Captain L. A. M'Clintock, who stated to M. du Toit that the order was that the oath of allegiance must be taken before a permit to proceed to the Transvaal could be obtained; and whether he will take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that his statement to the Boer Generals as to all prisoners of war having a choice between the oath and the declaration shall be carried out by the authorities at the Cape.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) A letter from M. du Toit on this subject has been received by the Secretary of State, and he has been informed that a copy of it has been forwarded to Lord Milner, who will communicate with M. du Toit. Lord Milner is aware that all prisoners of war have the choice of making a declaration or taking an oath of allegiance.

Education Bill—Eligibility of Local Officials for Membership of Education Authority.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether a medical officer of health appointed and paid by a Borough Council, at present a member of the School Board of that borough, may be a member of the new education authority or the Committee appointed by that authority; and whether a borough elective auditor, elected by the burgesses and paid by the Borough Council, may be a member of the new education authority or the Committee appointed by that authority.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I can only refer the hon. Member to Clause 18 (3) (*d*) of the Education Bill.

Education Bill—Obligation of Managers to defray Rates and Taxes.

MR. ARTHUR STANLEY (Lancashire, Ormskirk): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the provision that the managers of the school shall provide the schoolhouse free of any charge except for the teacher's house, if any, to the local authority, imposes upon the managers an obligation to defray all rates and taxes.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Bill does not transfer to the local education authority the managers' liability to defray taxes. Voluntary schools are exempt from rates under Section 3 of The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897. The effect of the Bill as amended in Committee does not differ from that of the Bill as introduced as respects this matter.

Evening School Regulations—Grants.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education are the grants payable under Section XX of the Evening School Regulations intended to reduce the total grants usually received by technical schools, or will the variable rates be so increased up to the maximum allowable so that schools of this kind will not be compelled to curtail their technological and commercial instruction.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Schools remaining at their former efficiency will receive grants equal to those which they would have received under the Directory of 1901. If increased efficiency is shown, the variable rates allow of increased payments.

Education Bill—Proportion of Taxation Paid by London.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what proportion of the £1,300,000, to be paid yearly under the additional grant under the Aid Grant Clause of the Education (England and Wales) Bill, will be paid (calculated on the usual proportions) by the taxpayers of London.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) It is not possible to say what proportion of the taxation of the United Kingdom is contributed by the taxpayers of London.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty—Secret Clauses.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will forgive me in asking him if there were any Clauses attached to the treaty between this country and Japan which have not yet been made public; and whether he will allow me to ask him whether he can inform me, without injury to public interest, if any pledges or assurances in connection with that treaty have been given which are not known to Parliament.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) I fear I can add nothing to the reply which I gave to the hon. Gentleman on the 19th instant,† which he will see covers the present case.

Coal Duty—Decrease of Shipment of Coal to Holland, Belgium and Baltic Ports.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the falling off in the shipments of coal from this country to Baltic ports since the imposition of the coal duty; if he will state what growth the coal shipments from this country to Holland and Belgium showed during the years immediately preceding 1901; and if he can afford any explanation for the decrease of one million tons, or over 60 per cent., in the shipments of coal to Holland in the first ten months of this year as compared with those in the corresponding period of 1900, or for the reduction to less than one-half of the coal shipment from the north-eastern ports to Belgium up to 31st October of this year as compared with that shipped in the same period of last year.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The facts stated in the Question as to the recent falling off in coal exports from the United Kingdom or particular ports to certain places appear to be correct. The shipments of coal to Holland and Belgium during the years immediately preceding 1901 were as follows: 1898, 1,204,588 tons; 1899, 1,936,517 tons; 1900, 2,964,366 tons. I am unable to assign reasons for the fluctuations which are continually taking place in particular branches of our coal exports. Generally speaking, I may say that the year 1900 was quite exceptional as regards our exports, not only of coal, but of other commodities, and any decline in coal exports since that year has accompanied, as usual, the general decline in trade activity which has taken place both in the United Kingdom and abroad. If bunker coal be added to coal exported, it will be found that the total quantity shipped from the United Kingdom has actually increased since 1900.

Bushey Park—Concession of Land to London United Tramways Company.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the hon. Member for North Hunts., as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware that the Hampton Urban District Council applied to the Office of Works in the first instance to concede a portion of Bushey Park; that the intimation of the park lands being granted to the London United Tramways Company, in consideration for other lands owned by the Company, was first conveyed to the Hampton Urban District Council by an official of the Office of Works asking the approval of the Hampton Urban District Council to the arrangement; that land on the opposite side could have been purchased by the Tramway Company whereby the loss of part of Bushey Park could have been avoided; and, seeing that the trees in the portion of Bushey Park which is to be surrendered are of more value than those on the ground of the Tramway Company to be given in exchange, and that a large proportion of the trees on the ground now owned by the Tramway Company, and to be made over by them to the public, are dead, will he state what action he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) (1) No; the Hampton Urban District Council did not make such an application. (2) No land is to be granted to the London United Tramways Company. The First Commissioner has already stated this twice in reply to Questions. The Company and the District Council were informed that this Board would not approve of adding any part of the park to the public roadway simply at the instance of the Company, but only at the special request of the District Council, as a public improvement. (3) This is the third Question in which the suggestion is conveyed that this public improvement should be effected by the Tramways Company being compelled to purchase the property opposite to the park on the river bank. Such a widening of the road would necessarily seriously diminish the size and impair the beauty of the public garden which has been there formed by the District Council with admirable public spirit. The only advantage would be, apparently, to enable the owner of any residence on that side of the road to dispose of his property to the Company if he dislikes the coming of the tramway. (4) The question of the trees has already been carefully considered. The trees on the ground to be added to the park are fully equal in value to those to be thrown into the roadway or removed. Several of the latter are dead or decaying, and would have been removed soon in any event. Some will be transplanted. (5) This is not the fact.

---

† See preceding volume, page 1350.

Royal Artillery—Status of Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether Lieutenant-Colonels of both branches of the Royal Artillery are, on completion of their period of regimental command, to be placed on the same list as regards further appointments and promotion; and, if so, will he say what steps are being taken to secure the prospects of the officers of the Royal Garrison Artillery being suitably employed, seeing that their contemporaries in the Royal Horse and Royal Field Artillery obtain promotion now so much more quickly.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Since the division of the regiment into mounted and dismounted branches, Lieutenant-Colonels are considered for further employment in the branch to which they belong. Should any employment become vacant which is open to both branches, Lieutenant-Colonels on both lists are equally considered.

Commissions for Militia Officers—Allotment.

MR. GOULDING: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the twenty Commissions for Militia officers, stated by the War Office Notice of the 8th July, 1902, to be placed at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, have been allotted; and, if not, when it is proposed to allot them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) These Commissions have been allotted, and the officers will be gazetted in due course.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Censorship of Letters and Cablegrams.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is now any restriction upon, or supervision of, communication by the mails or over the cables to and from any portion of British South Africa; and, if there be such, to what colonies or districts is it applicable, what is its nature, and in whose hands does the controlling power lie.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The answer is in the negative.

South African Mortgaged Lands.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is now in force within the Transvaal and Orange River territory any ordinance or other legal provision suspending the right of sale or foreclosure of mortgaged lands with a view to securing a reasonable delay for debtors who have, owing to the recent war, been prevented from satisfying their creditors; whether if any such provision is now in force, it will be affected by the withdrawal of martial law in the Transvaal should that withdrawal take place shortly; and whether, if the withdrawal of martial law should affect any such provision, the propriety of securing a reasonable further period of delay for mortgage debtors will be seriously considered.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: By a proclamation of 28th May last, it was provided that exemption from payment of interest on mortgage bonds should cease on 1st June, as regards interest accruing after that date, but no actions at law should be brought or maintained for the capital sum of loans for which bonds on land or other fixed property have been passed for six months from that date. I am advised that the withdrawal of martial law will not affect the validity of this proclamation in any way. The right hon. Gentleman is aware that martial law has been withdrawn.

Mr. BRYCE: What are the terms of the arrangement, and for what length of time will it remain in force?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As I understand at the present time, the *moratorium* will expire in six months from 1st June last.

Mr. BRYCE: Is it intended to extend the period?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That depends upon the circumstances.

Treatment of South African Loyalists—Case of Rev. Mr. Vlok and Rev. J. F. Botha.

Mr. WANKLYN (Bradford, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies a Question of which I have given him private notice, viz.—if it is a fact that a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, Mr. Vlok, has been deprived of his living for loyalty to the Crown and to the Government of Cape Colony during the war; if it is a fact that another minister, Mr. J. F. Botha, has been compelled to publicly apologise for having endeavoured to promote peace; if it is a fact that the national scouts and others who helped us in the later stages of the war have been threatened with excommunication; and if it is the case that many loyalists, both British and Dutch, are being subjected to persecution in Cape Colony by means of boycotting——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must really compress his statement. He must ask a Question and not make a speech. [An Hon. Member: "Crystallise" it.]

Mr. WANKLYN: I want to know if the Government of Sir Gordon Sprigg, under the control of the Afrikander Bond, are providing compensation for rebels out of the proceeds of funds derived from this country. In a sentence—is it the fact that many loyalists are being subjected to persecution by boycotting, while rebels are being compensated out of funds derived from this country?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid it is true that the Rev. Mr. Vlok has been deprived of his living, and that the Rev. Mr. Botha has publicly apologised for action which he took, as he says, in the interests of peace. I confess that I very much regret this action. Nothing could tend more to delay the union and prosperity of South Africa; and I regret this action the more because it appears to proceed from a religious body. I hope that the statements which have been made in this country with regard to the boycotting of the national scouts and the loyalists are exaggerated. I am assured that that is the case. As a matter of course it will have my attention; but in the meantime I should not like to say more than that I think that, while there do exist some grounds for complaint, I hope the proceedings which we should all deplore, have not been as general as may have been supposed by those who have read the accounts in the papers. As regards the alleged compensation to rebels, I think there is some misapprehension. As I understand the matter, the last Act affording compensation passed by the Cape Parliament provides that the amount contributed to this purpose shall, in the first place, be given to those who have been loyal throughout the war. But if there were any balance remaining after their claims had been satisfied, it was intended to proceed to compensate those persons who, having joined in the first rebellion, subsequently surrendered and remained loyal afterwards, and whose losses were incurred while they were loyal. That is a very different thing from what is suggested in the question; but in regard to that I ought to add that His Majesty's Government have informed the Cape Government that they will not permit any money derived from Imperial sources or from the resources of the Transvaal, to be employed in the compensation of rebels in any circumstances.

South African War Medals.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that under the present regulations for the distribution of the Queen's South African war medal, and the King's South African war medal, numbers of officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Regular Army who served during the earlier portion of the South African war for periods of from eighteen months to two years and upwards receive only one medal, whereas those who served for the same or shorter periods during the later period of the war receive two medals; and whether, in view of these facts, he will reconsider the question of the issue of the war medals to officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Regular Army.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am sorry that my hon. friend is not satisfied with my previous answer on this question, but I regret that I have nothing to add to it.

Military Uniform Changes.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that, owing to the alterations in uniform ordered by the authorities, officers have had to supply themselves with a fresh sash (the pattern approved in January, 1902, having been changed), new fronts to their frock coats (the width between buttons having been altered), spat putties in place of gaiters (since which spat putties are not regulation), new sleeves to the service coat with badges of rank, and a new service great-coat during the past twelve months; and will he say who is responsible for these alterations.

MR. BRODRICK: As regards the sash no alteration has been made in the pattern since January, 1902. The alteration of the distance between the buttons in the frock coat was for the purpose of improving the appearance. As regards spat putties, they were made regulation on the introduction of the service dress, and remain so, except for mounted officers of dismounted units who asked for and were granted permission to wear the ordinary putties without spats. The pattern legging for mounted units is not yet settled: and meanwhile officers are allowed to wear the Stohwasser gaiter or puttie. The badges of rank have been altered because the former patterns were not sufficiently distinctive, but new sleeves are not required for the service coat. The new service great-coat became a necessity on the introduction of the service dress. Certain alterations in dress have been deemed necessary by the military authorities, but it is desired to reduce these changes to a minimum.

MAJOR RASCH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman how an officer can live on his pay and defray the cost of all this millinery?

Destruction of Defective and Dangerous Ammunition.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that ammunition exceeding £27,000 in value has been thrown overboard from His Majesty's ships; whether this was practice ammunition; and whether he can say if it was thrown overboard with the object of avoiding the carrying out of the prescribed gunnery course.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I have seen the statement to the effect suggested in my right hon. friend's Question. The statement, however, is devoid of truth, and is entirely without foundation. In September, 1899, a certain class of ammunition was reported by the authorities of the Royal Laboratory at Woolwich to be defective and dangerous, and in consequence the whole of the ammunition of this character issued to ships was, by order of the Admiralty, thrown overboard, a course which was believed to be the wisest and safest under the circumstances. The value of this ammunition was, approximately £27,000. The whole of the circumstances have been inquired into by the Comptroller and Auditor General, who has correctly stated them in his Report issued to this House.

H.M.S. "Good Hope."

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the space between decks of H.M.S. "Good Hope"; and will he state what space is deemed necessary by the Admiralty to ensure the health of the midshipmen and crew on board cruisers of that class.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No special attention has been drawn to the space between decks of the "Good Hope." The space available in that vessel for the midshipmen and crew is sufficient not only for the proper complement of the vessel, but for some supernumeraries in addition, if considered necessary to carry them. The case of each ship is dealt with on its merits, and it is impracticable to frame a rule universally applicable.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the heat between decks on board this vessel is unbearable to the crew?

MR. ARNOLD FORSTER: I have no information.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: That is the case, though.

Argentine Affairs—Mr. Barnett's Murderers.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the murderers of the late Mr. William Barnett, in the Argentine Republic, have yet been punished according to the laws of the Republic; and, if so, what penalty has been inflicted.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): As I informed my hon. friend on the 10th of September last, under the provisions of Argentine law, sentence on the murderers of Mr. Barnett should be delivered by the 28th December at the latest. But until that date there are no good grounds for protest.

Uganda Currency.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the proposed Order in Council relating to local bank notes in the Protectorate of British East Africa will apply to Uganda also.

LORD CRANBORNE: No suggestion has been made that we should apply to Uganda the proposed Order in Council relating to the local issue of bank notes in the East Africa Protectorate. We have no reason to believe that any such currency facility is as yet required in this Protectorate.

Somaliland Operations—King's African Rifles.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs which of the battalions of the King's African Rifles have been ordered for service in Somaliland, and to what races the troops in those battalions belong.

LORD CRANBORNE: The whole of the 2nd Battalion and of the 6th Battalion, King's African Rifles, together with contingents from the 1st, 3rd, and 5th Battalions have been ordered for service in Somaliland. The 1st and 2nd Battalions are composed of Yaos and Atonga; the contingents from the 3rd and 5th Battalions of Soudanese and Sikhs respectively, the 6th Battalion is composed of Somalis.

Education Bill—Position of Welsh Intermediate Schools.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether schools established by scheme under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act will be considered as provided or only as aided by the local education authority.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Such schools are not provided schools.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: Then will the Education Bill, when passed, override the provisions if these schools were established?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Not in itself.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: Suppose the Bill to be inconsistent with the scheme, which would prevail?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I understand the hon. Member's Question to be whether these schools will be provided or aided. My reply is, that they will not be provided schools under the Bill.

Mr HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in the event of the passing of the Education Bill in its present form, it will be in the power of the local education authority in the counties of Wales and Monmouthshire to withdraw wholly or partly the Exchequer contribution from schools established by scheme under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, and to apply the moneys so withdrawn to the aiding of other secondary schools.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY was understood to reply that for this purpose an Amendment of the Bill would be required, and he proposed to put one on the Paper.

Western Hebrides Mail Service.

Mr. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been drawn to the character of the boats carrying His Majesty's mails in the Western Hebrides, and to the fact that the time occupied in the run from Oban to Barra is from eight and a half to nine and a half hours, while, on one occasion lately, the steamship "Staffa" took from 1.30 to 8.30 to go from Lochboisdale to Castlebay, a distance of twenty-one miles, and on another occasion, after trying for three or four hours to steam to Barra, the boat had to put back into Lochboisdale; and whether he will arrange that the contractor shall substitute faster and safer boats.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): I have made enquiry respecting the steamers carrying the mails in the Western Hebrides. I find that the steamer "Flowerdale" takes from seven to eight hours for the voyage from Oban to Castlebay (Barra), and that the "Staffa," which performs this portion of the service in the reverse direction, generally takes from eight and a half to nine and a half hours in winter and about eight and a quarter hours in summer. Mr. MacBrayne has undertaken to have the "Staffa" fitted with new engines this winter, and it is expected that her speed will thereby be appreciably increased. With regard to the incidents referred to by the hon. Member, the first occurred on the morning of the 7th instant. The "Staffa" left Lochboisdale at 2 a.m. on that day, but, owing to stress of weather and extreme darkness, the leading lights of Castlebay Harbour were invisible, and the steamer had to lie off until the weather cleared sufficiently to enable her to enter the harbour. This she ultimately did at 8.25 a.m. The second incident occurred on the 15th of October during a severe gale, when the steamer traffic generally on the West Coast of Scotland was disorganised. Both of the steamers in question are certified as "safe" by the Board of Trade each year, and in view of the heavy loss already incurred on the service, I cannot promise to take any steps to secure the substitution of faster boats.

Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now able to make a statement as to the precedence of the Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): The King has been pleased to approve that the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland should have precedence, in Ireland and during his term of office, along with the Archbishops of the Church of Ireland and all Roman Catholic Archbishops in Ireland according to the date of consecration or election; that is to say, immediately after the Lord Chancellor of Ireland if the latter is a Peer, and immediately before him if a commoner.

Irish Electoral Division Boundaries.

*Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board will institute an inquiry into the boundaries of County Council electoral divisions upon receiving a memorial from any considerable body of county electors.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): By Article 25 of the Application of Enactments Order of 1898, the power of the Board to institute an inquiry of this character is expressly provided to be dependent upon the receipt of a representation from the council of a county or borough. The reply to my hon. friend's Question is, therefore, in the negative. I see many objections to dealing with the question of redistribution in a piecemeal manner.

Irish Land Question—Supposed Consultations between Government and Irish Party.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps have been taken by him to consult the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary Party as to the measures necessary for the settlement of the Irish land question.

MR. WYNDHAM: I read their speeches, and I have made speeches myself, to which I have repeatedly referred the hon. Member. They contain all I have said and all I have to say, for the present, on the subject of future legislation.

MR. TULLY: Has authority been given either by the right hon. Gentleman or any of his colleagues to Mr. O'Brien to say that he had a deal with the Government?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered this Question, and I must refer the hon. Member to the speeches I have made in this House. I have nothing to add and have added nothing to them.

Irish Grazing Lands.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from Boards of Guardians and other public bodies in Ireland Resolutions in favour of a measure of compulsory sale, and of dividing the grazing lands amongst the population in the congested districts; and whether he can state what steps he is prepared to take to give effect to these Resolutions.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not propose to anticipate the explanation of the Government proposals by replies to questions across the floor.

Tipperary County Infirmary Committee.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been directed to the proceedings of the Tipperary County Infirmary Committee, who have refused to carry out the directions of the Local Government auditor as to finance meetings; and whether he can state what steps will be taken in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The audit of the accounts of the County Infirmary was carried out by the Board's auditor at the request of the Committee of Management. But there is no statutory duty imposed upon the Board of auditing the accounts of these institutions, nor has it any power to enforce compliance with any suggestions made by the auditor employed to examine these accounts. I have no information in respect of the concluding inquiry.

Colonel Clement's Estate in South Leitrim.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the cases of twelve tenants on Colonel Clement's property at Loughrynn, Dromod, South Leitrim, were heard before the Land Sub-Commission on the 6th June last, and the lands inspected on the 18th July, he will explain why no decision has yet been communicated to these applicants for fair rents.

MR. WYNDHAM: The asisstant Commissioners will announce their decisions in the course of a few days.

Dromore Disturbances.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the disturbances at Dromore, County Down, on the occasion of a meeting to express the views of the farmers on the land question; what complaints, if any, have been received as to the action of the police on the occasion; and what steps will be taken to prevent further disturbances in Dromore.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The hon. Member for South Tyrone has complained that his meeting was interrupted, and that a stone struck him after the meeting. The police escorted the hon. Member. An inquiry has been ordered into all the circumstances, and ample protection will in future be afforded to the hon. Member.

MR. TULLY: Has no landlord or landlord's son been arrested because Mr. Russell's head was cracked?

London and the Education Bill.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what amount of grant, under the new Aid Grant Clause, would, in round numbers, be payable to the elementary schools of London under the Education (England and Wales) Bill for the first twelve months after the Bill comes into operation, if the provisions of the Bill applied to London.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that we have no special materials at our disposal for answering hypothetical questions as to the amount London would get. It is, of course, impossible to assume the precise date when the Bill will come into operation in any area under the Bill, and if we are fortunate in passing our Bill for London next session, there is no reason why London should not come under the operation of the Bill earlier than many other areas. I would remind the hon. Gentleman that there was an Amendment down, which, for reasons the House knows of, we did not move, extending the period before the Bill actually comes into operation from a year to eighteen months. We still think some extension of time is necessary, and we propose to move it at the next stage.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Do I understand that it is difficult to get data on which to found an answer?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It must be hypothetical.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I understand the probabilities are that the Bill for London will come into force as soon as that for the other areas.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My answer is, I do not know any reason why we should not pass a Bill for London that will enable London to come in before the last-appointed day that will apply to other areas.

MR. BRYCE: We may take it that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill dealing with London next session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly. That is my hope.

Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any change has recently been made in the constitution of the Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that no change has been made in the constitution of the Department.

MR. COGHILL: May I ask whether the Vice-President is still performing the duties of the office, and still taking his salary?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir.

MR. COGHILL: Was there not a distinct pledge given that this office would be a Parliamentary one?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think any distinct pledge was given. I am quite sure nobody acquainted with the work which the Vice-President of this Department has done in Ireland would do otherwise than think that the appointment has not only fulfilled, but more than fulfilled, any expectations formed of it.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2) Bill.

Amendments to, Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords] without Amendment.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

That they give leave to the Lord Welby to attend in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on "National Expenditure," his Lordship consenting.

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

*(2.35.) THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): In moving the Resolution which stands in my name, I venture to express a hope that on one point at least connected with the sugar question the great majority of hon. Members on both sides of the House may find themselves in agreement. Great differences of opinion may, no doubt, exist with regard to particular provisions of the Convention. There are many people who may object to the appearance in it of a penal clause. I believe there are certain persons who regard countervailing duties as a kind of damnable heresy—an unclean thing which this country ought never to look at, much less to touch or handle. I do not myself agree with that view, which appears to me to be the outcome of an exaggerated economic prudery. But I am not concerned for the moment to defend the penal clause, although I shall return to the subject later. What I wish at the present to emphasise is a point of agreement; and I hope that I am right in believing that the large majority of people in this country, however divergent their views may be on other political and economic questions, are at least agreed in thinking that sugar bounties are a bad thing, and that the abolition of sugar bounties would be a good and desirable thing. I am aware that this opinion is not absolutely unanimous. There is a section —I believe a very small section—who hold that the existence of sugar bounties is a good thing, and who would be sorry to see them abolished, even by the voluntary action of the bounty-giving Powers; and who are *a fortiori* opposed to any action on the part of this country which would tend to promote their abolition. But I think all those who have studied the history of the question will agree that that position is absolutely inconsistent with the policy steadily pursued by both parties in the State for the last forty years.

It is perhaps unnecessary to labour the point as far as the Party now in power is concerned. But the Liberal Party are quite as much committed to the general principle that sugar bounties are a bad thing, and ought to be abolished, as the Conservative Party itself. The question of sugar bounties first rose into international importance in the early sixties. In 1862, when Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, a conference was called, on the invitation of France, to consider the question of sugar bounties. To that conference, France, England, Belgium, and Holland were parties; and it resulted in a Convention which, unfortunately, was never given effect to, but respecting which we have the opinion of Mr. Gladstone placed on record. The object of the Convention was so to equalise the duty on sugar and the drawback given on the export of sugar as to destroy any advantage or bounty to the exporter. Mr. Gladstone declared in 1866 that that was a very beneficial arrangement in the interests of the consumer, the importer, and the refiner alike; and he gave as his reason that the Convention would tend to equal trade. But while Mr. Gladstone, thus early in the history of sugar bounties, committed the Liberal Party to the view that the abolition of sugar bounties was desirable in the public interest, the Convention was interesting for something more. It contained a clause which pointed to the possible application of countervailing duties as a remedy for the inequalities produced by sugar bounties. That clause of the Convention ran as follows:—

> "The high contracting Powers reserve to themselves to agree as to the steps to be taken for obtaining the adhesion of the Governments of other countries to the arrangements of the present convention. In the event of bounties being granted in the said countries on the exportation of refined sugars, the high contracting Powers will be at liberty to come to an understanding as to the surtax to be imposed on the importation of refined sugar of and from the said countries."

The surtax to be imposed on the importation of refined sugar was really a countervailing duty under another name. I only refer to this in passing because my present object is not to defend countervailing duties, but to point out that from the first the Liberal Party has been committed to the policy of abolishing bounties, at all events as far as that end could be accomplished by remonstrance and negotiation.

I pass on to the year 1879. During the intervening period many conferences had been summoned to consider the question, but all these conferences had, unfortunately, proved abortive. In 1879 a Committee of the House of Commons was appointed on the Motion of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That Committee reported in 1880 in favour of a further attempt to obtain the suppression of the bounties by means of international agreement. The Committee also reported, or rather stated that they would have reported, in favour of countervailing duties but for one difficulty—the difficulty which might arise in connection with the most-favoured nation Clause in international treaties. In 1881 Mr. Gladstone endeavoured to give effect to the Report of the Committee by summoning a conference. That conference proved as abortive as its predecessors, because France insisted as a preliminary on the acceptance by this country of the principle of countervailing duties, to which the British Government of that day were unwilling to consent. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman cries "Hear, hear!" Yes: but let me draw the attention of the House to the language again used in 1881 by Mr. Gladstone with reference to the bounties. On 18th May, 1881, in answer to a deputation, Mr. Gladstone used these words—

> "We do not regard with any satisfaction the system under which an artificial advantage is given in our markets to the products of foreign labour, the principle to be observed being that of equality. Some people say it is a good thing because the consumer gets the benefit of it; but I do not think that any benefit founded on inequality and injustice can bring good even to the consumer."

It is thus apparent in 1881 that Mr. Gladstone, speaking with the full authority of the Prime Minister, continued to hold the same opinion as he had expressed in 1866.

I pass on to the year 1899. Very important developments had taken place in connection with the sugar question in the interval between 1881 and 1899. Germany and Austria, in consequence of the bounty given to the producers of sugar, had been gradually gaining upon France, and had become the largest sugar exporting countries on the Continent. Sugar bounties, which up to 1880 had affected refined sugar rather than raw sugar, now began to press ever more and more on raw sugar also, and thereby in particular upon the sugar industries of our West Indian colonies. In 1889 another conference was summoned—this time on the invitation of Lord Salisbury—and that conference resulted in a Convention. There is no doubt that this Convention did bring us nearer to the abolition of the sugar bounties than we have ever been until the present year. That Convention, however, also failed, and once more chiefly because France refused to come into line with the other bounty-giving countries. Although by this time the bounty-giving countries appeared more and more anxious if possible to come to some arrangement by which they should be relieved of the heavy yoke which the bounty system placed upon them, the failure of that conference was, as a matter of fact, followed by large increases in the bounties given. In 1896 and 1897 both Germany and France doubled their bounties, or nearly doubled them. In 1897 the United States adopted the principle of countervailing duties—that principle from which this country had so long shrunk—and shortly afterwards their example was followed by the Indian Government. In 1899 a Vote of Censure was moved by the Opposition on the Government in consequence of their having approved the action which had been taken by the Government of India. A very instructive debate followed, a debate which turned not so much on the condition of things in India as upon the merits or demerits of countervailing duties as a remedy for the evils of the bounty system. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition summed up the debate, and while condemning the adoption of countervailing duties as a remedy for the sugar bounties he was careful to guard himself against any suggestion that hon. Members opposite were not as keen and as anxious for the abolition of the bounties as we on this side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman used these words—

> "The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India invited my right hon. friend the Member for Wolverhampton to go to the country in defence of the system of bounties, but the noble Lord must know perfectly well that we are as much opposed to the system of bounties as he is. I agree with my right hon. friend in regarding bounties as merely another form of protective duties. We need not speculate as to which is the worse of the two. These bounties appear to me to be bad. They disturb trade and hinder the development of the country; so that I do not see what there is to be said in favour of them. There is no quarrel between us upon that score at all; where we differ is as to the remedy to be applied."

I think I have shown that the Liberal Party, no less than the Conservative Party, is committed to the principle of doing whatever can be done by remonstrance and negotiations, at all events, if by no stronger means, to get rid of the sugar bounties. They may differ from us with regard to the means which may be advisable or desirable to use in order to secure this end, but they agree with us in desiring to see the end secured.

Leaving this part of the subject, I come to the considerations which have determined this almost unanimous consensus of hostility to the sugar bounties. I believe there are some people who are in favour of getting rid of sugar bounties, not because they think the bounties are contrary to the interests of this country, but because they believe them to be contrary to the interests of the countries which impose them. I admire such cosmopolitan benevolence; but I admire it at a respectful distance. If British interests were not involved, I, for one, should not think that British statesmen were under any obligation whatever to assist the nations of the Continent in extricating themselves from the difficulties which their own policy, deliberately adopted, has brought upon them. But British interests are affected. In the first place they are involved in a general way, because we are, I think, entitled to hold the opinion that any such notable advance in the direction of cosmopolitan Free Trade, as would be necessarily involved in the abolition of the sugar bounties, would be in the long run and in one way or another, possibly working through channels the exact course of which we may be unable to trace out exactly beforehand, in the interests of British trade and enterprise. But, in addition to that general consideration, British interests of a particular and special kind are involved. When I speak of British interests, I need hardly say that I include the interests of the Empire as well. Imperial interests are British interests, and are indeed among the most important of British interests. First of all, there is the case of the sugar refiners. I think their case is a hard one, and I do not suppose any one will dispute the unfair character of the competition which they have had to face from foreign refiners who have got the long purse of their Governments behind them. The sugar-refining industry is being gradually supplanted by foreign produce, and it appears to me, as it appeared to Mr. Gladstone, that our sugar refiners have very serious grounds of complaint. But while the sugar refiners have suffered, and are suffering, and certainly deserve our sympathy, the case of the West Indian colonies is so grave and so urgent, that I am bound to say I think they have the first claim upon our sympathy and attention. How grave and how urgent is the case of the West Indies was made apparent five years ago by the Report of the Royal Commission which was specially sent to the West Indies to investigate the question, and of which the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick was a member. Let me draw attention to one distinction between the case of the sugar refiners and the case of the West Indian colonies. In the case of the sugar-refining industry, even supposing that that industry is altogether squeezed out of existence by the unfair competition to which I have referred, it would be still possible for those who were engaged in it to be gradually absorbed in other occupations. The case of the West Indies is different. We have there to deal, not merely with a section of the population engaged in one among a large number of different industries, but with the condition of whole societies. What is at stake in the West Indies is the fate of entire communities under the British Crown. Take away the export trade from the West Indies, and you take away from them the means of maintaining a civilised Government. Of all the exports of the West Indies, in the majority, at all events, of the islands, sugar is by far the most important; so much so that if you were to destroy the sugar industry you would practically destroy the power of those Governments to raise a revenue or to carry on the work of administration in a proper and efficient manner. I do not wish to inflict more quotations than are necessary on the House, but the result of the destruction of this industry has been described in such vivid, and at the same time measured, language by Sir Henry Norman, who was chairman of the Commission, that I venture to read it to the House. Sir Henry Norman said—

> "I think the British public hardly realise the ruin that must follow a collapse of that industry. Such a collapse would seriously affect even the West Indian colonies which have other industries to fall back upon, such as Trinidad and Jamaica; but British Guiana, with nearly 300,000 people, Barbados, with 180,000, and all the Windward and Leeward Islands, excluding Grenada and Dominica, and perhaps Montserrat, may be said to have nothing to export except the products of the sugar cane. The inhabitants of those colonies would, therefore, be without the means of purchasing imported articles of food, or of paying taxes, the bulk of which are indeed derived from Customs duties levied on imports or from Excise. The planters must be ruined; many others who have drawn incomes from sugar properties will be seriously affected; the tradesmen, artizans, and labouring classes will suffer privation, and probably become discontented and restless, and the revenue will be so crippled as to render it impossible to carry on the Government, even on the most economical scale, in any condition at all approaching to efficiency. Nor will it be practicable to meet obligations for interest on debt, or to provide for the relief of the poor, or to maintain the hospitals and schools, or to pay the police force, while in Guiana, and possibly in Trinidad, there would be a demand for the repatriation of large numbers of Indian coolies, to meet the cost of which measure funds would not be forthcoming."

Such were the dangers which five years ago the Royal Commission declared to threaten our West India Islands. Since that time we have been endeavouring, I will not say to avert the calamities that were imminent, but, at all events, to suspend them, by means of that most unsatisfactory of palliatives, the payment of Imperial subsidies. If those dangers were imminent five years ago they are still more imminent now. For on what does the prosperity of the sugar industry in the West Indies depend? First of all, of course, it depends upon the price which sugar will fetch in the market, and in the second place on the command of capital, or, in other words, the credit possessed by the producers. As regards price, at the time the Royal Commission reported the price stood at about the figure at which sugar could be brought from the West Indies to this country without actual loss to the producer. That was about 10s. per cwt. It had fallen from 21s. to 10s. per cwt. between the years 1882 and 1897. That was the price—just about the cost of production—at which sugar stood when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick and his colleagues reported. Last September the price had fallen to about 6s. In other words, in September of this year sugar was actually being sold in the London market at 30 per cent. less than it costs to produce and to bring it to England from either Germany or the West Indies.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the price now?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The price has risen since September, but it still is considerably below the cost of production. So much for price. As to credit, credit was precarious at the time the Royal Commission reported; it is now practically a vanished quantity. Anyone interested in this matter can judge for himself by reading the Blue-book containing the correspondence with the West Indian colonies relating to the Sugar Conference. From almost every colony in the West Indies the same bitter cry rises—that the existing crop will not pay expenses, and that for the coming crop no advances are available. This condition of things has been much aggravated by the appearance of a new form of indirect bounty in Austria and in Germany, the result of which has been enormously to increase the already large direct bounty given by those two countries. I refer to what is known as the Cartel system. The Cartels are trusts or rings which by combination between producers and refiners of sugar succeed in securing a monopoly of the home market—practically determining the quantities to be sold in the home market and the price at which it is to be sold—and, basing themselves on the enormous profits which they make out of this monopoly, they are able to export the surplus at actually less than it costs to produce. The success of this system, however, depends upon the difference between the Customs duty and the excise duty being so great as to enable the Cartels to force up the price of sugar for home consumption to an abnormal level. The House will, therefore, see that the success of the Cartel system depends on two elements; first a successful combination between producers and refiners; and secondly, a large difference between the internal duty and the Customs duty. The insidious character of this system will be obvious, and its effectiveness in creating bounties may be judged from this fact—that, calculating upon the system laid down by the Convention as the basis for estimating the amount of the bounty, the German sugar bounty arising from the Cartel system amounts to no less than 3s. 10d. per cwt., and in Austria to 4s. 4d. per cwt. As the direct bounty given in Germany at present stands at 1s. 2d. per cwt. and in Austria at 1s., the House will see that the total bounty on the export of sugar in Germany amounts to no less than 5s., and in Austria to no less than 5s. 4d. There is no Cartel system in France; but in France the indirect and the direct bounty taken together amount to very nearly 4s. Thus those three greatest sugar-producing and sugar-exporting countries on the Continent give bounties which allow a margin of artificial advantage of 4s. to over 5s. per cwt. to the producers and exporters, a margin with which they can play to the detriment of sugar-producing countries which have no bounty. It is certainly not to be wondered at, in view of disadvantages of this kind, that the sugar producers of the West Indies have been well nigh reduced to despair, and I think it will be clear to everybody that, unless we can come to their aid by securing the abolition of those enormous bounties, there is practically no hope that the sugar industry in the West Indies will survive. There is still time to save it. I do not suppose that the palmy days of that industry will ever return; but if the bounties were abolished, I see no reason whatever for doubting that a large proportion, at all events, of their old prosperity might be restored to the islands. That is not merely my own opinion, but it is also the opinion expressed by the Royal Commission. Not only did the Royal Commission take the view that the restoration of the sugar industry to a condition in which it could be profitably carried on was possible and probable if bounties were abolished, but they held that there was no other way of restoring the industry. [An hon. Member dissented.] I am correct in saying that the abolition of bounties was the only remedy which the Royal Commssion declared could be expected to have a permanent and lasting effect. It is in the power of the House by its vote tonight to render the Convention null and void. What course will it pursue? If it refuses its approval to the policy embodied in the Convention, what justification will it have for that refusal?

I see that this Motion is to be met by a direct negative. I cannot help regretting it. I regret it partly because I am sorry that there should be any opposition to this Resolution at all, and I also regret it because I think it would have been advantageous that we should have had on record on the face of the proceedings of this House a reasoned statement of the grounds upon which that opposition is going to be based. As it is, I am left to conjecture the reasons which the right hon. Gentleman is going to give for the course that he and his friends intend to adopt. But one ground, it appears to me, they are hardly in a position to put forward. They can hardly contend that this Resolution should be opposed because the interests of the consumers and the sugar-using industries of this country are involved. The economic effects of the abolition of bounties would be the same, whatever means are employed to secure the consent of the bounty-giving Powers to that abolition. I think I have already sufficiently shown in the opening portion of my speech that the Opposition as a body are committed to the principle of the abolition of bounties. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling Burghs says there is nothing to be said for bounties; the only question was as to the means to be employed. The economic consequences of abolishing sugar bounties were fully and frankly faced by the Royal Commission. They recognised that the suppression of bounties would probably, nay, almost certainly, be followed by some rise in price, but that did not prevent the Royal Commission from recommending the abolition of bounties. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling Burghs, like the

Royal Commission, will have the courage of his opinions, and that he, too, being an advocate for the abolition of bounties, will not shrink from the economic consequences which must follow from that abolition. If he has, as I hope I may assume he has, the courage of his opinions, he and those who think with him will not claim to resist this Resolution on behalf of consumers of sugar, or of the industries which use sugar as a raw material. No doubt a direct negative to the Resolution will bring into the same Lobby with the Leader of the Opposition those who, unlike himself, are out-and-out supporters of sugar bounties, and desire to see sugar bounties retained, but I think I am entitled to say that although the out-and-out supporters of the sugar bounties may be found in the same Lobby with him, they will not be there for the same reasons.

Now let me turn to the argument of those who are out-and-out supporters of the sugar bounties. I believe they are comparatively a small minority, but I am sure they are sincere, and the arguments they use are arguments with which we have to reckon. Speaking for myself, I entirely agree with the Royal Commission that even if the interests of consumers of sugar and users of sugar did, to some extent, suffer from the abolition of bounties, that abolition would still be an object for which we ought to strive. But I cannot help feeling that the fears that are entertained with respect to the rise in prices that may possibly follow the abolition of bounties, have been very much exaggerated. I will even go so far as to say that in the long run the abolition of bounties will not injure the consumers, but possibly protect them from the danger of a still greater rise in the price than is likely to follow the abolition. It is no doubt true that the abolition of bounties will be followed by some rise in price, if present prices are taken as the starting point from which the rise is to be measured. At the present moment the price of sugar is below that of the cost of production. It must be obvious that if anything like free trade in sugar is established it would be absolutely impossible for the price of sugar to permanently continue under the cost of production. Such an anomaly as that is only possible under the bounty system. But what guarantee is there that the present price will continue? I think anybody who carefully examines the history of prices during the last twenty years will come to the conclusion that the bounty system, by encouraging over-production, has a tendency to cause violent and unnatural fluctuations in prices, and that if the price is very low now it may sometime in the not very remote future be very much higher than it is at present. In September last the price of sugar was 6s. per cwt.; it is now 7s. 10d. That is, that between September and now there has been a rise of something like 2s. That may be taken as an illustration of the rapid fluctuations which occur under the bounty system. But if we want a fair estimate of what the price of sugar is likely to be after the bounties are abolished, what we must look at is, in the first place, the average price during the past ten years, and in the second place the cost of production at the present time. Now the price of sugar in the London market is practically determined by the price of what is called 88 per cent. beet free on board at Hamburg. The average price of that sugar has been 10s. 6d. per cwt., or £10 10s. per ton, during the last ten years. I venture to make the confident forecast that the average price of sugar during the coming ten years, if bounties are abolished, will not exceed the average price during the ten years that are passed, but will in all probability be less. On what do I base this forecast? I have taken a great deal of trouble to ascertain the cost of production of sugar both in the West Indies and in Germany, and I think the House may take as fairly accurate the figures which I am about to give. The cost of producing 88 per cent. beet sugar in Germany and carrying it to the London market may be put at £8 15s. per ton. The corresponding price of sugar from the West Indies, after the proper allowances are made, is about £8 10s. per ton. But let us neglect the small difference of 5s. per ton in favour of the West Indies, and assume that the cost of producing sugar and bringing it to London is £8 15s., both from Germany and the West Indies. Under a free trade system in sugar you would have to add to that a sum representing reasonable profit in order to arrive at what I may call the normal price. I am informed that a reasonable profit on sugar may be put at from about 20s. to 30s. per ton. Let us put it at 25s. per ton, and add that to the £8 15s. representing the cost of production and carriage per ton, and you arrive at the figure of £10 per ton. That figure of £10 per ton will be the normal and natural price of sugar, so long as the cost of production remains the same. We may take it, on the basis of this calculation, that £10 a ton is likely to be the average price of sugar during the next ten years in the London market if bounties are abolished, and therefore, having regard to the fact that during the last ten years the average price has been £10 10s. per ton, I am justified in the forecast that during the coming ten years the average price of sugar will not be more than it has been during the past ten years. In fact, I think it is almost certain to be less, because in making this calculation I have not allowed for possible improvements in manufacture, which during the last ten years have been considerable. I see no reason to suppose that the same process of improvement will not continue during the next ten years, though possibly in a less degree. If it does, then we are justified in saying, not merely that the probable average price of sugar during the next few years may fairly be put at £10 a ton, but that it may be put at that figure minus whatever may be gained by improving the processes of manufacture. It may be said that if bounties continue the average price will be even less than the figure I have named. I think that is very possible, and even probable, during the first year or two after the abolition of bounties, but will it continue? What will be the ultimate result? It must be remembered that even now the strain put by the bounty system upon the West Indies has practically reached breaking point, and if things continue as they are that source of supply, at all events, is almost certain to be cut off. I do not say, as some have urged, that the bounty-giving countries on the Continent have deliberately aimed at that result; on the contrary I think myself it is merely an incidental consequence of the mad war of bounties which they have waged, and are still waging, against each other. If anyone will take the trouble to look at Czernikoff's circular of last Friday week, he will see that at the present time Austria and Germany are the only countries on the Continent supplying the British market. None of the other sugar-producing countries—France, Belgium or Holland—can afford to let their sugar go at the same low price. That is a state of things which cannot be expected to continue indefinitely. One of two things will happen—either under the stress the bounty system, even without the action of this country, will break down, or else, and this is quite as probable, Austria and Germany will secure the supremacy over all their rivals, and then will follow a condition of things under which the price of sugar is likely to rise far more than is probable merely as the result of the abolition of the bounties.

Now, Sir, I have given my reasons for believing that the consumer and user of sugar will not be nearly so hardly hit by any possible rise in the price of sugar as many of them appear to think. That is my general answer to what appears to me to be the exaggerated fears that have been expressed on their behalf. I have however been informed that they are beset by a special and peculiar apprehension. Russia is outside this Convention, and they are afraid that if Russian sugar is excluded from the markets of the Contracting Powers, it will pour into Switzerland at the low price rendered possible by bounties, and Switzerland will in this way become an even more formidable competitor with the British sugar-using industries than she is at present. I think those who are alarmed by this prospect may be reminded that the export of sugar from Russia at the present moment is not so much to European as to Asiatic countries. If Russia really desires to export the surplus of her sugar produce to Europe, it is far more likely that she will join the Convention and thereby be enabled to export her sugar to this country, where, *ex hypothesi*, according to the fears which have been expressed, the price will be higher than it is at present. As a matter of fact, Switzerland never has taken, and does not now take, any appreciable quantity of Russian sugar. Switzerland is a large importer of sugar, but not from Russia. Unless the surplus produce of Russia was sufficient to supply Switzerland with the great bulk of what she requires, the price of sugar in Switzerland would be determined, not by the price at which bounties will enable the Russian exporters to place their sugar on the market, but by the price which would have to be paid for the larger supply of sugar from elsewhere. These considerations convince me that this fear, arising from the suggestion that Russia will flood Switzerland with cheap sugar for the benefit of the Swiss manufacturer——

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich): That is after bounties are abolished?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, assuming bounties are abolished. It seems to me that that fear is nothing but an unsubstantial bogey. But if it should prove a reality, I would remind my hon. friend that this would be just one of the things for the permanent Commission to consider. As Switzerland is surrounded by France, Italy, and Germany and Austria, all of which are parties to the Convention, and as all these countries would be equally injured with ourselves if cheap sugar was poured into Switzerland, I think we may fairly rest assured that the Commission would take such steps as were necessary for their protection.

I have now dealt with the arguments with reference to the interest of the consumer and the user of sugar in this country, but I have not yet reached any objection which, as it appears to me, the Opposition may legitimately urge having regard to the attitude they have taken up and the statements they have made on this subject in times past. I suppose, however, they will concentrate themselves on the penal clause. Under the penal clause, the parties to the Convention are bound either to prohibit the entry of bounty-fed sugar or to impose upon it countervailing duties which will be equal at least to the bounties given in the country of origin. No doubt, if it had been possible, we should have been very glad to get the bounties abolished without the insertion of a penal Clause. Unfortunately, that was not possible. It was a case of "no penal Clause, no Convention." We were obliged to take both or neither, and if that is to be the issue between us tonight we are perfectly prepared to abide by it. The House will observe that the penal Clause offers two alternatives. It will be open to this or any other country which is a party to the Convention either to prohibit the entry of bounty-fed sugar, or to impose countervailing duties upon it. Personally, I imagine that prohibition would practically in every case be sufficient for the object in view. I do not know whether hon. Gentlemen opposite consider prohibition preferable to countervailing duties. Perhaps I may assume that they do. I am, however, quite ready to rest the defence of the Clause on the supposition that countervailing duties may possibly have to be resorted to, and if that defence is successful, I may, perhaps, fairly take it for granted that it will cover the case of prohibition also.

I understand I am to be followed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, who will probably favour the House with one of those portentous disquisitions—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"]—well, let me change the adjective, and say one of those admirable disquisitions on the virtues of Free Trade with which he has on more than one occasion made us familiar. I am afraid I may shock his susceptibilities when I say that it appears to me that no great advantage is to be gained by discussing the question from that purely abstract and theoretical standpoint. The question whether countervailing duties are or are not consistent with Free Trade principles is one which may be discussed to the end of time and answered in the affirmative or in the negative according to the definitions of Free Trade with which the disputants start. Even the right hon. Gentleman himself, I think, will not deny that the abolition of bounties constitutes an important step in the direction of Free Trade, and if the threat of countervailing duties secures that abolition, countervailing duties must, to that extent at all events, be regarded as an instrument of a Free Trade policy. But the further question whether the use of that instrument is or is not in harmony with Free Trade principles is one which, as I say, will be answered in accordance with the definition of Free Trade from which we start. Whatever you put into a definition you can get out of that definition. If you hold that an essential element of Free Trade consists in the attainment of the natural price of a commodity, then it must, I think, be obvious that countervailing duties are not only consistent with, but almost enjoined by, Free Trade. If on the other hand, you regard as an essential element of Free Trade the keeping open of the cheapest source of supply, no matter how artificially that cheapness may be produced, then countervailing duties are not consistent with Free Trade. In favour of both of these definitions very high authorities may be quoted. The former definition is that which commended itself to Mr. Cobden, and apparently also to Mr. Gladstone. The second definition is that which found favour with the late Lord Farrer, and I suppose finds favour with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire himself. But for my part I confess the whole discussion appears to me to be very little more than a war of words, and I think it better to leave such barren controversy and consider the question from the practical point of view. I am glad to hear that cheer from hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I hope they will take the same view when the question of free trade and countervailing duties is discussed from the Front Bench on their side. My own desire is to discuss this question from a purely practical point of view, and for that purpose to examine the reasons, and I will do so very briefly, which have been adduced by the Royal Commissioners for thinking that countervailing duties are inadvisable and inexpedient as a remedy against the inequalities of the bounty system.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would first explain what would be the feeling of Russia and other countries with regard to the most-favoured-nation Clause if action was taken under this convention.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I propose dealing with that as part of the question on which I am now entering. The Royal Commission gave certain reasons for holding that inconveniences and disadvantages would follow from the adoption of countervailing duties. On that I would remark, in the first place, that the question the Royal Commission had to decide was entirely different from the question which this House is asked to decide this evening. The Royal Commission had to consider whether they should recommend countervailing duties taken by themselves as a remedy for the evils complained of. What we have to consider is whether countervailing duties are justifiable, not taken by themselves, but as part of a Convention to which all the great sugar-producing countries are parties. And this, let me observe, makes the entire difference. If countervailing duties were to be imposed in the absence of any agreement with the principal sugar-producing countries, it is obvious that these countervailing duties would have to be a reality, and a possibly very formidable reality, inasmuch as they would have to be imposed against the very countries who are now imploring us to adopt such duties as a protection to each other against the unfair competition of each other's sugar in the British market. Countervailing duties, as part of the Convention embracing all the principal European countries except Russia, are obviously very much more in the nature of a threat than a reality; a threat which it may possibly be unnecessary ever to put into execution.

Now, Sir, it will be seen, when I come to the objections urged by the Royal Commission, that this consideration really takes away or greatly diminishes, the force of every one of them. The first objection raised by the Royal Commissioners was that

> "The levy of countervailing duties of varying amounts, according to the country of origin, would give rise to disputes and delays which must to some extent have the effect of harassing and impeding trade."

Obviously there can be no question of countervailing duties between ourselves and the great majority of the countries in Europe who are parties to the Convention, and therefore that objection is reduced almost to the vanishing point.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: How about Russia?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It must be obvious to my hon. friend that, in regard to any inconveniences of trade arising out of countervailing duties, if Russia, which hardly exports any sugar to this country at all [AN HON. MEMBER: It may.] were the only country concerned, these inconveniences would be much less than if the duties had to be levied against Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Belgium, and Spain.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: But your own colonies might be concerned.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The second objection urged by the Royal Commission was that—

> "The levy of the countervailing duties in the United Kingdom would also probably involve the imposition of similar duties in India and in some of the colonies of Australia, both of which countries at present receive supplies of beet sugar."

As we all know, India has already set the example of imposing countervailing duties; and, as regards the Australian colonies, it is open to them to join the Convention, and if they did so, it would be a matter for congratulation and not for regret. The third objection is that

> "The levy of countervailing duties on the bounty-fed sugar might raise serious difficulties under the operation of the most-favoured-nation clause in commercial treaties with foreign nations, and it would not be to the advantage of the United Kingdom to encourage any laxity in the interpretation of that clause."

The fact that countervailing duties are levied under a Convention reduces this objection almost to nullity. The question cannot arise between us and the other parties to the Convention. The only important countries with which, as far as I can see, it is possible that it could arise are, first of all, Russia, and, secondly, the United States. ["Hear, hear" from the OPPOSITION Benches.] Yes, Sir, but the question has already been raised with Russia in consequence of the action of the Indian Government; and three years ago Russia was informed that the Government did not consider that countervailing duties were inconsistent with the most-favoured-nation clause, and it was further intimated that, if the Russian Government unfortunately would not accept that view, we were prepared to denounce the commercial treaty between Russia and this country. That seems a sufficient answer with regard to Russia. The United States have themselves been the first country to adopt countervailing duties; and, therefore, so far from its being likely that we shall have a difficulty with the United States, it is clear that the United States are agreed with His Majesty's Government that these duties are not inconsistent with the most-favoured-nation clause. The fourth and last objection is that a doubt exists

> "Whether in the general interests of British trade it would be wise, on this issue, to open so large a controversy, which may possibly spread so far and lead to a war of tariffs."

Again I say that the very existence of a Convention embracing all the most important countries in Europe, with the exception of Russia, is itself a guarantee that no such serious consequences are likely to follow. It is obvious that there is not the least likelihood of a war of tariffs with any other country in Europe.

Now, Sir, I have done, and I really must apologise to the House for having taken up so much of its time. The problem presented to His Majesty's Government in connection with this difficult and complicated subject was this: Were we to forego the success of the policy which has been pursued for the last forty years by every Government, Liberal and Conservative, in turn—were we to forego the success of that policy at a time when the fate of the West Indian Colonies was hanging in the balance, in deference to economic scruples, which appear to me to have been at all times greatly exaggerated, but which under present conditions have really lost almost all their force? We have seen what many have wished to see, but it has not been given to them to see—a concert between all the principal European Powers for the abolition of all bounties on sugar, direct and indirect, provided this country will consent, by the insertion of a penal clause into the Convention, to give to the agreement an effective sanction. If we had allowed this opportunity to pass by a very heavy responsibility would have been thrown upon our shoulders. It was in our opinion our duty to take advantage of it, and I trust that this House will give our action its support and endorsement by its vote this evening. I beg to move.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

(2.58.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I think it will be to a certain extent a relief to the House that there is a change of the drama this week. We have before us a question which is not involved in any religious difficulty. Not but what there are heresies in trade as well as in religion. I can relieve the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down of the fears he entertains that I am going to enter upon a "portentous" discussion of an abstract question. I never had the smallest intention of doing anything of the kind. On the contrary, I shall endeavour to rival the concise and lively discourse of the right hon. Gentleman. The question is not a small one. That, I think, the House must understand. The instruction to the delegates who negotiated this Convention was to confine themselves to, or to make it their object, at all events, to deal with the case of the West Indies and the case of the sugar refiners. If that was the only matter for consideration under the Convention it would be a very narrow issue. But that is not the issue at all that is raised by this proposal. And here I am happy to agree with the right hon. Gentleman that what we have to consider are the interests in this matter of the British Empire at large. I hope that is a good Imperialist sentiment. It is one, at all events, I entertain. It is from that point of view I desire to examine this Convention, and from that point of view alone. I shall, I trust, be allowed to include in the British Empire the United Kingdom. I have myself always considered that England, Scotland, and Ireland are parts of the British Empire, and that their interests are not matters to be neglected.

Having said this much, I would refer only for a moment to a point on which the right hon. Gentleman has laid a good deal of stress, and that is, the action of the Party that sits on this side of the House in the year 1881. Well, Sir, that was the year in which I first became a responsible member of the Cabinet in the Liberal Government. I had a distinguished colleague who was President of the Board of Trade, and, therefore, if the opinions of the Government of that time are to be taken, they must be taken from the President of the Board of Trade in the year 1881 as the exponent of the views of the Government of that time. The right hon. Gentleman quoted some passages from speeches, but this is not a passage from a speech; it is from a memorandum issued on this very point by the then President of the Board of Trade. It contains an expression of the views of the Government of that time. I am not going to enter upon any *tu quoque* argument. I am going to read two or three sentences which, in my opinion then and in my opinion now, express a sound view upon this question. In that memorandum I find this:

> "As the policy of this country has been for many years to prefer the large consuming interests of the whole community to the small producing interests of any single class, the Government was not prepared to recommend any remonstrance to foreign Governments regarding their bounties, on the ground of alleged injury to the trading interests of this country."

Then there is one other sentence which expresses the considered view of the Government of that time:—

> "Protective duties in foreign countries are even more injurious to the interests of this country than bounties, since they operate no less than bounties to the disadvantage of our producers, whilst, unlike bounties, they confer no benefit on our consumers. If duties are to be imposed to counteract foreign bounties, *a fortiori*, ought they to be imposed to counteract foreign protective duties? To impose countervailing duties in order to neutralise the indirect bounties would, therefore, be to take the first step in reversing that Free Trade policy which was adopted on the clearest grounds of argument, and has conferred immense advantages on the industrial classes of this country."

That is all it is necessary to say to make clear what was the view, expressed by its authorised exponent, of the Liberal Party in the year 1881. In that year the right hon. Gentleman the present Colonial Secretary refused to attend a meeting of the anti-bounty agitators in Birmingham, and wrote as follows:—

> "I regret that the Birmingham Trades Council should allow itself to be made the

instrument of what is essentially a class interest. If you were, unfortunately, to succeed in imposing countervailing duties on foreign sugar, the effect would be that the consumers in this country, principally of the working classes, would, according to the figures supplied by the sugar refiners themselves, have to submit to a tax of something like £1,000,000 sterling per annum, in order to put this sum into the pockets of the West Indian planters and a few sugar refiners in the United Kingdom."

These are the views which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade thinks it worth while to recall to the attention of the House, and to make a great part of his argument when referring to the views entertained, as he said, by Mr. Farrar, and (he paid me the compliment to say) by myself; but neither Mr. Farrar nor myself, who entertained these views, could have expressed them with the force and lucidity which characterised the utterances of the Colonial Secretary.

Now, Sir, I promise the House that as regards what we may call general principles, that is all I intend to say on the subject. I desire to address myself solely to the practical consequences of this Convention. I need not say that I have, in common with all the rest of the House, an entire sympathy with the distress now existing in the West Indian Colonies; but what we have got to determine is whether this is the best method of redressing and repairing that distress consistently with the general interests of the British nation in all parts of the world. It is not a narrow issue upon the mere situation of the West Indies. This House has already this year shown its readiness to give its assistance to a large extent. We may desire the prosperity of the great sugar refiners as of all trades in this country; but what we have to consider is whether the course adopted for the benefit of the sugar refiners may not be injurious to other interests which are equally important—indeed more important than that of the sugar refiners. I want to place before the House that what we have got to determine tonight is a matter affecting the policy of the greatest commercial nation in the world. It is an issue of very great extent, which will have very serious consequences.

The essence of this Convention is what has been properly called the penal clause, and the question is—What is going to be the effect of your introducing into it a penal clause which does not exist in your present system, and which will have an important bearing in relation to your commerce? The penal clause is, of course, one of the most serious parts of this Convention. Now, the fundamental principle of our Customs duties is that they are raised for revenue alone. They are not raised for what I may call the incidental purpose of raising the price of commodities. Now, the object here has been to raise the price of the commodity in order to benefit the West Indian sugar interest. Our Customs duties are not raised to protect a particular interest. That is the Protectionist theory. That is not the theory of the Free Trade policy, which is the policy of this country. We are never tired of boasting, and truly boasting, of the "open door." We are preaching it to all nations, and I am happy to say that at present we practise it ourselves. But this is a Convention to shut the open door. Under what conditions are we called upon to shut the open door? Under the open door there is no question as to the goods brought to us. There is no question of certificate of origin. We do not ask where the goods come from. We ask what the goods are. We do not ask what is the domestic and fiscal policy of the country from which they come. We have nothing to do with that. They present their goods to us and we accept them if we consider that they are worth our acceptance and worth our dealing with. We profess to be the free market of the world. But this is a Convention which is to restrict the freedom of that market, and to place the commodities brought to our markets under examination to see whether the policy of the country that produces them is a wise policy or not—to examine into the character of these goods, where they come from, and under what conditions they have been produced. But that is not to be determined by ourselves. We are not even to be allowed to judge of that. The judges of the policy we are to pursue, the duties we are to impose, and the prohibitions we are to declare, are to be a permanent Commission consisting largely of our rivals in trade. We are to be there with a single vote, with a standing majority of seven against us, upon those questions which are finally to decide what is to be our system of taxation, and what is to be the rule of our trade.

Now, that is a much larger question than the distress in the West Indies. Those are the things we have to decide, and it is a decision of the most momentous character as affecting the trade of this country. You are going to put the key of the open door into the hands of a great European syndicate—a syndicate that may create a trust which may be injurious to your trade when you have abandoned the autonomy of your commerce, and when you have abandoned the system which has brought to you the greatest prosperity, and to the people of this country the greatest comfort and the greatest support. This is not a small question which has to be decided upon by the vote tonight. What a satire it is upon the open door that when goods are brought to you you say, "Oh! no, we will not accept them. They are too cheap. Why! you are selling them for less than they cost." That is the open door! Of course, he sells them to us at less than the cost. But he will have to pay for them by taking goods from us which we sell at more than cost price. That is what I call good trade for us and very bad trade for him. It is a very simple commercial principle, which I thought would have been understood by the President of the Board of Trade. I am speaking in the general interests of the British Empire. In our private transactions I am not aware that any of us complain of our tradesmen supplying us with goods at less than cost price. The foreigner offers us goods under the market rate; that is a thing that we forgive.

But there is another matter involved in this question. It is not only a disturbance of our trade in that respect, but it is a question of finance. It destroys the independence of our finance. I see the Chancellor of the Exchequer there. I ask him what would become of his Estimates? Who is to determine the rate and character of those Estimates if he is not to go to his advisers to know what is likely to be the yield of the sugar duties, but that is to be settled by a permanent Commission? The President of the Board of Trade asked whether we preferred prohibition to countervailing duties. Well, prohibition has been pressed by the Government into this Convention. It was not suggested by any of the other parties; it was the Government that insisted on prohibition. What is the effect of prohibition? Countervailing duties leave you the sugar which you want; they are open to great objections, but at all events you get the sugar and you get the revenue; but under prohibition you get neither the revenue nor the sugar. Therefore, if there is a country which commits the terrible sin of offering you a commodity which you want, and which is the food of the people, you have bound yourself, under covenant, to prohibit these goods coming into this country at all. Of course, nobody would have preferred countervailing duties to prohibition. The Government knows perfectly well that when you come to countervailing duties the confusion will be such in your finance that it will be impossible to deal with it. I will show you what has happened under countervailing duties. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India introduced countervailing duties in India two years ago, and a nice mess he made of it. A more ignominious collapse could not have happened. The Chancellor of the Exchequer will be no longer master of his own Budget. He may make Estimates which may be entirely defeated either by countervailing duties or by prohibition; and therefore the Estimates of his revenue will totally fail. Now, these are matters which are very large, matters which are far beyond the question of the West Indies. I am glad to see, speaking of the West Indies, an account in the newspapers of the extremely flourishing condition of the principal island in the West Indies, Jamaica.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham): That is not quite accurate, I am sorry to say.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I read it in the newspapers this morning or yesterday.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. What I meant to say was that that description only shows that the island, after the greatest difficulty and economy, has been able to make the revenue meet the expenditure. That does not mean prosperity.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: All I want to say is that I read in the newspapers about the great prosperity of Jamaica. The right hon. Gentleman knows a great deal more about it than I do. I hoped it was the case, and I am sorry to hear it is not. The right hon. Gentleman said a great deal on the subject of bounties. It is perfectly true that I, and most of my friends, do not approve of the principle of bounties. It has been truly said that a bounty is a form of protection, and I disapprove of all forms of protection. I disapprove of bounties because they partake of the character of Protection. I entirely concur that bounties are a bad thing for the people who give them. They do not exactly participate in the quality of mercy, as described by Shakespeare, because, although those who receive them are blessed, they curse those who give them. In that respect they differ. That they are bad things for the people who give them everybody must agree; they are good for the purpose of subsidising particular interests, but a very bad thing for the rest of the community. I hope we shall never adopt the principle of bounties, though I fear nowadays the proposal for subsidising particular interests is too readily entertained. I hope we shall never allow any system of bounties in this country. But bounties differ from Protective tariffs in this respect. Protective tariffs injure both those who make them and those who are subject to them; but in the case of bounties the injury is to one party only, and they more or less benefit the other party. Now, the policy of bounties in the countries on the Continent of Europe has been a policy of what is called "cutting rates." They have endeavoured to compete for our market and have consequently given these bounties against one another, hoping to secure the control of that market. Well, like all false principles, like everything partaking of the character of Protection, that has turned out a failure; in the long run they have to go from bad to worse, and at last these bounties have become so oppressive to these countries that they are determined to get rid of them. It has cost them millions. They have paid too dear for their whistle; and consequently they want to get somebody to help them to get rid of them. That is their affair, and I entirely agree with the President of the Board of Trade that that is not the principal consideration by which we ought to be governed. We ought to look at this matter and other matters of business as to how it affects British interests. That is the only point of view in which I desire to regard it. As good neighbours we should be very glad to assist these foreign countries in any way that does not injure us in any form; but when we are asked to pay a price which is injurious to us, in order to enable those countries to deliver themselves from the unwisdom they have practised, that is another thing. There are many relations of life in which the unwisdom of men redounds to the advantage of those who have been wiser. That is the case with reference to bounties, as with reference to everything else. But what is the price that we have been asked to pay, and which, under this Convention, we do pay? We have heard of the advantages that we are to gain under this Convention, and of the disadvantages that we should experience under Prohibition. Now, the first advantage that is offered to us under this Convention is that sugar should be dear! Well, on the face of it, that does not seem to be any great advantage to anybody. Cheap sugar is, on the whole, a good thing. It is one of the principal articles of consumption of the people, and the fact that this Convention is to make sugar dear does not, on the face of it, appear to be of any great advantage. But if it does not make sugar very considerably dearer, it is of no good to the West Indies at all; and, therefore, the whole thing to determine is, how much dearer is it going to make sugar? Anyone who knows anything of trade, still more especially of the sugar trade, must say that the Government ought to have avoided such an indiscretion as that. At all events we know what is expected in the West Indies and what was predicted by the minority of the Commission. It is that the price of sugar will be increased by a halfpenny a pound. That is a very considerable increase on the present price of sugar, and I imagine that that is the real view of the Government, because I think the Colonial Secretary said, speaking in July last on the subject of the Vote for the West Indies, that bounties were measured at £5 a ton.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think that I could have said that. I think if I said £5 a ton, I referred to that as the maximum. Then I should surely have gone on to argue that you measure any possible bounties not by the maximum but by the minimum bounty.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But you were speaking of the West Indies, and the bounty has lowered the price of sugar by £5. I wish only to remark that £5 does represent the halfpenny a pound of which I spoke, and therefore that is the figure which the West Indies seem to think is the only thing that can be of real service to them. This is the opinion of Sir Henry Norman, the Governor of Jamaica:—

> "It must be admitted that if countervailing duties are levied and have the desired effect, the people of the United Kingdom will have to pay more for their sugar than they do at present, perhaps to the extent of a halfpenny a pound."

Let us see how that works out. I am asking whether it is worth our while to pay the great price, or any price at all, to bring about a change which will raise the price of sugar to the extent that the West Indians demand. That is the real principle; it is not a question whether it is a good thing for these countries to abolish bounties; it is whether it is worth our while to pay this heavy price. What will be the result upon sugar? The total import of sugar into the United Kingdom is, I think, 1,600,000 tons, and the West Indies send us 46,000 tons only. The total production of the West Indies, which is the point with which you have to deal here, is 240,000 tons. There is a certain disproportion of interests at stake. If you have regard to British interests at large you must have regard to the interests to be benefited and the interests which will be injured by the course you pursue. It is a very serious matter to raise the price of a commodity of which you take 1,600,000 tons by a halfpenny a pound. That means a sum of £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 a year which has to be paid by the consumers in this country. Cannot you relieve the West Indians cheaper than that? This burden of £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 is coming at a time, too, of high taxation after the war, and when you have raised the duties on sugar, tea, beer, corn, and other commodities of consumption. We are not sitting here merely for the purpose of considering what relief we may give to one particular portion of the Empire; we are considering how we are going to affect the masses of the people in this country. But in addition to our own people at home there are British subjects all over the world who are interested in the price of sugar, and your object, therefore, is to raise the price of sugar everywhere. You cannot raise it in England alone; it must be raised in all parts of the Empire. The estimated consumption of sugar, I am glad to think, is 90lb. a head for every man, woman, and child in this country, and when you multiply that amount by six or seven, according to the number of a family, it becomes a sensible sum if you raise the price by a halfpenny a pound. Then there are the poor refiners. I am very sorry to think that the refiners are suffering. The only refiner I had the honour of knowing was a gentleman with whom I was associated in my official capacity to establish the Tate Gallery, and in those conversations and negotiations I did not arrive at the conclusion that the refiners were a ruined interest. At all events we cannot leave out of sight the fact that there are other trades which will be injured by the rise in the price of sugar. Every one knows that the trade connected with the manufacture of sugar, confectionery, and other industries, is a very large one. I have had supplied to me a statement showing that the number of hands employed in the various branches of this trade is not less than 200,000 persons. Therefore you have to consider, in what you are doing, whether, while you are benefiting the refiners you are not injuring a trade of more importance than that of the refiners. I say, therefore, that the making of sugar dearer is not in itself an advantage; it is of no greater advantage than it would be to make corn dearer. Do not let us be told, "Oh, you said the price of sugar would be dearer when it was taxed; it was no dearer, and when the bounties are abolished it will not be dearer." The President of the Board of Trade tried rather to "ease off" the increase of price, but the more you diminish the price the less good you do to the West Indies, and the more you raise the price for the benefit of the West Indies the more harm you do to the people here. This, indeed, is a Convention to raise the price of sugar, and it raises it by a sensible amount. We are told that the West Indies are irreparably ruined by the present price of sugar. We have been told, in the calculation of the President of the Board of Trade, that the West Indies must have £10 a ton for their sugar, that they had it once, and they cannot live on less.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No. What I said was that £10 a ton will leave a reasonable margin of profit.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is to say, a living wage. Trades that do not get a reasonable profit soon come to an end, but what the Government aim at in this Convention is to give them £10 a ton for their sugar. There is a quotation *ad rem* to which I ask the attention of the House. It is from the Report presented to the House with reference to what has happened in Cuba. In Cuba they have gone through very much the same experience as the West Indies have gone through. The traders have been very much alarmed and distressed and almost ruined owing to the price of sugar; and a report has been presented by our very able Consul in Cuba. He says—

"The vitality shown by Cuba in the rapid rehabilitation of its sugar industry during 1899–1900, with practically no financial assistance from abroad, to which I called attention in my last annual report, has been still more strikingly exemplified by the remarkable progress which has been since made, in spite of the continued steady fall in the value of sugar and the discouraging prospects of the market. The crop of 1900-01, which proved to amount to 635,856 tons, realised very fair prices on the whole, averaging a little over 10s. per cwt.; but the fall which commenced in January became far more accentuated in September, and the known existence of unusually large stocks of beet as well as cane sugar in the principal markets excited the gravest apprehension among the planters. Meetings were held, and appeals, which received the active support of the military governor, were made to the United States Government to grant a reduction in the duties on Cuban sugar, in which it was positively stated that, if the existing crisis continued, a large proportion of the factories would be shut down, thousands of people would be thrown out of employment, commerce would be paralysed, the revenues of the Government would fall off, and widespread misery culminating probably in public disorders would be the result. After months of agitation in the Press of the United States, as well as of Cuba, the American Congress adjourned without having done anything in the matter, and in the meanwhile by far the largest crop taken in since 1895, amounting to over 800,000 tons, was successfully harvested and has eventually been sold at prices which have averaged a trifle over 6s. 7d. per cwt. In spite of the very low prices obtained, none of the evils which were so confidently predicted have come to pass."

This is the state of things in Cuba, with sugar at £6 10s. a ton.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Blackfriars): Has that sugar been refined at all? I understand that to be raw sugar, which is £2 less value.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes. Of course all these figures relate to raw sugars, as did the figures of the President of the Board of Trade—

"Not a single factory," the Report continues, "failed to work to its fullest extent; the demand for labour, in view of the magnitude of the crop, was greater if anything than in previous years; and the low price at which the sugar was sold being compensated by the much larger output, imports, and consequently also the customs receipts, have shown no falling off at all—rather the contrary. Moreover, to the surprise of everybody, the threatened severe losses to individual planters have been proved to be wholly imaginary, and while the profits made have not, of course, been sufficient to meet heavy mortgage charges, I have heard of no well-appointed estates on which the working expenses were not amply covered, besides leaving in many cases a small margin of profit.'

Therefore, when we are told that it is impossible that sugar can be made at anything under £10 a ton, the extract I have just read is a refutation of the statement.

Now, Sir, all I have said up to this time is on the assumption that this Convention will raise the price of sugar, but there are a great many people, and I believe the best judges, who think that that is very doubtful. What is the history of the fall of the price of sugar? It is, of course, the great export supplies of sugar from all sources. That is not the work of bounties alone or Cartels alone. It has been the work of the industry and skill and science of the people. Why is it that beet sugar has come into this overwhelming competition with cane sugar? It has been, as everybody knows, by the science that has been applied in Germany, France, and Austria, and, above all, the chemical science, in the production of saccharine from beet. These are the sources of the success of the beet sugar, and you will not destroy that by doing away with the bounties. Every year there will be more and more of this beet land brought into cultivation. Do you suppose that the United States are going to rely ultimately on those countervailing duties? No; in this very correspondence of the West Indian Planters' Association there is a statement that they expect very soon that the United States will produce all their own sugar. Where will a Convention of this kind be when Cuba can produce 800,000 tons, three times the whole of their production? Therefore I say the assumption that this is going to raise the price of sugar in a manner which will repair the losses of the West Indies is not well founded, as some people imagine. Let us see if countervailing duties will succeed. The House three years ago authorised the establishment of countervailing duties in India in the interests of Mauritius, who complained that they were beaten out of the field by the beet sugar. What happened? In the first year before the duty operated the beet sugar stood at 1,526 tons, in the second year it was reduced by the operation of the countervailing duty to 872, and in the third year, under the operation of the duty, to 2,900. That is to say, it was three times as great in the second year after the imposition of the countervailing duty as it was before. What is the condition of the cane sugar industry of Mauritius? It has not increased at all. In the last year it was rather less than before the countervailing duty was put on, whereas beet sugar was very much larger. The Mauritius people say that in spite of the countervailing duty imposed in 1899, beetroot sugar is enabled by direct and indirect bounties to flood the Indian market at prices with which it is impossible for them to compete. This is the state of things produced under countervailing duties authorized by the Government in order to save Mauritius, that—

> "One-third of the crop can find no purchaser except at prices which will be disastrous to the planters."

Was there ever such a ludicrous failure? But they say—"Oh, there is the Cartel; that must be dealt with." And this Convention professes to deal with the Cartel. There is a long letter from Mr. Martineau pointing out that the Cartel will operate still, and you will find, and this is most remarkable, that the Indian Government, which imposed these duties, in two despatches this very year have repudiated your Convention and said they will not be governed by it.

> "The Indian Government," they say, "is unwilling to bind itself unreservedly to accept the decision of the conference as to what are and what are not to be regarded as bounties in the case of countries which did not participate originally in the Convention."

So the Convention is condemned by your Indian Government.

Let me say that there is one article in the Convention that I certainly do not complain of; on the contrary, if the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, I should like to compliment him upon it, because I think it is a very favourable omen. I refer to the article that covenants that you are not to grant preferential duties to colonial sugar. I am glad that the policy of preferential duties is not one that commends itself to the Board of Trade. The worst part of the Convention undoubtedly is the obligation it imposes upon us for suppressing bounties against a non-signatory State. That covers the question of indirect bounties, and that is a question which you are not to decide, but a permanent Commission. Then there is sub-Section (*d*), which says:—"Advantages derived from excess of yield." Is that an advantage that you are to legislate against, because a country has an excess of yield, or because by its chemical skill more saccharine can be extracted out of the crop? I should like to have some explanation of that; it is the most extraordinary provision, I think, that was ever put into a Convention. Any one who wishes to form a real judgment of this Commission should read Article VII. of the treaty. That any British Government with respect for its trade or finance, should ever have allowed to be imposed upon it conditions which will destroy altogether the independence of its commerce or its finance, is a thing that to my mind is absolutely astounding. They say it is done by a majority, but remember you are in a minority of one. Then, by Article VIII., you are bound "to take the necessary measures to prevent bounty-fed sugars which have passed in transit through a contractingry count from enjoying the advantages of the Convention on the market to which it is being forwarded," so that you are not only to ask the country of origin, but by what route it has been taken. Is it possible to conduct trade under conditions of that kind? It seems to me to be injurious in the greatest degree.

Then the right hon. Gentleman talked about Russia. Russia is a non-signatory to the treaty. If Russia gives a bounty you are bound to prohibit Russian trade in sugar with this country. What happens? You lose the Russian sugar, but you lose a good deal more than that. I have read, and suppose it is true, that when sugar was put under countervailing duties by the United States, Russia acted against certain trades of the United States. It is quite plain that you do expose yourself to retaliation in this matter, and are certain to suffer from it. The right hon. Gentleman talked about the most-favoured-nation clause. That is the key, really, to the commerce of this country; you have lost particular commercial treaties, but you rest on the most-favoured-nation clause, and to imperil the most-favoured-nation clause is the greatest danger and injury you can do to this Empire. I do not know whether I understood the President of the Board of Trade rightly or not, but he said the Government told Russia some years ago that if they did not take off the prohibition or the countervailing duty they would put an end to the treaty. Is that the most-favoured-nation treaty?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: What we said was that if Russia did not take the same view as the Government—that is to say, if the Russian Government insisted on regarding countervailing duties as inconsistent with the most-favoured-nation clause, under those circumstances we would be reluctantly prepared to denounce the treaty.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Denounce the most-favoured-nation Clause?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, the commercial treaty.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is worse than ever. It means that the introduction of these countervailing duties may be fatal, and probably will be fatal in many cases, to your commercial treaties. That is too great a price to pay.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It has already been done in at least two cases.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: So much the worse.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No harm has resulted.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: If you are prepared to denounce the commercial treaties, how far or how fast you are going in that direction no man can tell. If you are going to force the principle of prohibition or countervailing duties in this case, I suppose you will do it in others, and the price you will pay will be to destroy your commercial treaties, and to put in peril your most-favoured-nation clause. It is a terrible price to pay for advantages of this description; never was so bad a bargain made by an intelligent nation. There has been very little said of the United States in this matter; I wonder why the United States did not join in this Conference. I observe that in one of the early letters Lord Lansdowne asks why they did not, but I never found the answer to that question in the correspondence.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): They were not invited.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Why were they not invited? They have the greatest market in the world.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think they were formally invited——

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs said not.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, no; it was not the Under Secretary, it was the hon. Member for King's Lynn. I think they were formally invited, and they would, of course, have been welcome; but it was known that they did not wish to attend. If you ask why, it is because they are not an exporting country—not to any great extent.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I will tell you why they did not attend, in my opinion—because they were not prepared to place the taxation and commerce of the United States at the mercy of a permanent Commission sitting in Europe. Like the Indian Government, they preferred to govern their own taxes, to dispose of their own finance, and they were a good deal wiser than you have been in this matter. I do not believe that the citizens of the United States, who are pretty cute in these matters, would ever have accepted the government of the permanent Commission as it appears in this Convention. It is true they put on countervailing duties, but they were themselves the judges of them. If your Convention had kept in your own hands the countervailing duties and the prohibition it would have been a very different thing. The worst part of this Convention is the obligation into which you have entered. The evils of the Convention are admirably summed up by the Commission itself. The right hon. Gentleman said an extraordinary thing—that the Commission had recommended these countervailing duties.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, I said they had reported in favour of the abolition of bounties. It is perfectly well known that the Chairman was in favour of recommending countervailing duties, but the majority were opposed to it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then I misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. I will read the views of the majority of the Commission on this subject. They gave as their reasons for not recommending countervailing duties—

"The loss to the British consumer that would result from any rise in the price of sugar; the inconvenience to trade that would be caused by the imposition of countervailing duties; the uncertainty whether any such measure would permanently save the sugar industry in the West Indies (they did not believe this measure would have the desired effect of saving the West Indies); the inexpediency of raising questions connected with the interpretation of the most-favoured-nation clause, which might have the effect of weakening its force; and, finally, the danger, direct and indirect, of departing from what has hitherto been considered to be the settled policy of the United Kingdom."

In my opinion it is impossible to state more truly and soundly the real objections to this policy. It is, I believe, full of danger and mischief, and no advantage can be derived from it which is at all commensurate with the mischiefs with which it is pregnant. I beg, therefore, to move the Amendment on the Paper.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'House,' in order to add the words 'declines to approve of the Convention relating to sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902."—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question proposed—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*(5.13.) MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): The right hon. Gentleman has made a speech, the first part of which was hardly consistent with the finish. In the earlier portions he appeared to have swallowed whole the statements of the pamphlets which have been sent round to us lately in such numbers, and to have assented to the proposition that there was going to be a very considerable rise in the price of sugar. The right hon. Gentleman quoted that familiar casual remark of Sir H. Norman's in the Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission. That remark was not a reasoned statement; it was not based on argument; it was merely a casual suggestion, and was quite inconsistent with the general views of the Report to which Sir H. Norman had assented. The views of the Report were those of the right hon. Gentleman in the latter portion of his speech—that as a result of the abolition of bounties there would not be any serious rise in the price of sugar; that there might be a slight rise, but not one so serious as to be a real argument against the general advantages which the Commission fully admitted would accrue if bounties came to an end. The right hon. Gentleman opposite quoted a remark of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which has been made familiar in all the circulars. Last year the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the debate said that the highest bounty upon sugar amounted to about £5 a ton. This has

been quoted as if he had made the converse statement, that if the bounty was taken off the price would rise by £5, but that has nothing whatever to do with the amount of the present bounty. If bounties were withdrawn the price would depend upon the cost of production. I claim as an authority for these views the last half of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, where he went on far sounder principles, and in which he pointed out the very great cheapening in the cost of the production of sugar. I confess that I am puzzled as to which half of the right hon. Gentleman's speech to take seriously. He indulged in a good deal of thunder against the Government on account of the great rise in the price of sugar which they were causing; but the alternative which I understood him to prefer was that taking away of bounties is no good because it would not raise prices enough to be of any use to the West Indies. If that is so, what is the necessity for all the thundering of the right hon. Gentleman against the policy of the Government, and which we have been familiar with outside.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT pointed out that even in that case the obligations of the duties would remain.

*MR. PARKER SMITH: Even if the price is not raised a great deal of good will be done to the West Indies by putting the producers into a position where they will have confidence, where capital can come back, and where they can calculate with the same degree of certainty as men engaged in producing any other great staple article what the cost of production and the price is likely to be. At the present time they are thrown out in their estimates by this incalculable element, and but for this fact I believe the West Indies could enter the fight upon reasonable terms. The right hon. Gentleman adduced the Indian experience in favour of his second argument that prices were not going to be seriously raised by the abolition of bounties. What happens? The Indian Government impose countervailing duties, the price rises for a little while and then drops. It did not rise to any great extent, or to anything like the extent, feared by hon. Gentlemen opposite. It afterwards fell lower because of a fresh reason, that reason being the Cartel system, which was not in existence before, and only sprang into being in the year 1899–1900. Therefore it is really within the last two or three years that this has become such a very serious predominant factor as it is at the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Indian Government wanted protection against any interference with its fiscal policy. Of course it does, and it can be protected under the terms of the Convention. The right hon. Gentleman complained that we were altogether in the hands of the permanent Commission, and that all our fiscal dealings in the Empire were put under their control. I wish to point out that we reserve complete freedom as to our fiscal relations, and we keep that in our own hands. I would refer the right hon. Gentleman to Article XI., where the Government of Great Britain in declaring that during the continuance of the convention no preference will be granted in the United Kingdom to colonial sugars, states that this is undertaken

"as an exceptional measure and reserving in principle entire liberty of action as regards the fiscal relations between the United Kingdom and its colonies and possessions."

That Article reserves entire liberty of action between ourselves and our colonies. There is no doubt what that phrase means. If you take that by itself it might be ambiguous, but it has to be read along with the declaration made by our representatives at the Conference. In making the announcement that this country was willing to accede to a penal Clause, Mr. Phipps added—

"Ni il convient de dire que la Gow. britannique ne pourrait appliquer une clause pénale aux sucres des colonies on des possessions britanniques. Des motifs de politique impériale (Imperial policy) prohiberaient une application pareille."—(*Proces Verbaux*, 5th Seance, p. 66.)

That was taken up in the course of the Conference again and again, and we were pressed to modify it. The other Powers said they did not see why our colonies should stand in a different position to foreign countries, but we adhered to that declaration, and it was accepted and universally understood by everybody.

The real substantial question is in regard to the rise in price. It is assumed that there will be a very great rise in price. In the first place, you cannot draw any conclusion at all from the amount of the present bounties. While bounties and trusts exist as at present the fluctuations are tremendous. The year of greatest fluctuation was 1889, when it went to £28 5s. per ton, or from £11 10s. to £28 5s.; the fluctuations each year are serious, and they are more serious than in other articles of commerce because they are incalculable and depend upon Government action. But when bounties go and the wings of trusts are clipped then the cost of production comes in, and it is that cost which will govern prices. That is what it is the merchant's business to calculate. There is absolutely the same uncertainty with regard to any other article which you can name, and the clever man of business is able to perform a more intelligent and correct forecast than his fellows. But in the case of sugar, whatever the producer may do he is liable to be met by an increase in the bounty on the part of foreign governments. Sugar if you only give it a fair chance can be produced under so many circumstances and in so many different quarters of the world that it is certain that plenty of capital will flow into the industry, and not more than fair profits will be obtained by those who produce sugar in different parts of the world.

The President of the Board of Trade has gone into the question of what will be the probable cost of production. He was speaking the views of all the responsible experts when he said that he did not believe that the average cost in the future would be higher than it had been for the last ten years. I know that my opinion is worth nothing in this matter, but I entirely agree with that view. The price of the last ten years is the price under which all the confectionery interests about which we hear so much have grown up. The right hon. Gentleman opposite mentioned the probability of a lower price. If the lower price will give a living profit, as apparently it does in Cuba, so much the better. Then we shall have capital going freely into the business, and I have not the slightest doubt that we shall have in the future, as we have had in the past, improvements in production which will bring down the cost of production from time to time, while at the same time they leave a living margin for those who are engaged in the business. The reduction in the cost of production during the last fifteen years has been something wonderful. Partly, no doubt, that is the effect of the stimulus of bounties, which has turned the intelligence and attention of foreign chemists to this subject of sugar production in Europe, and the West Indies have certainly followed suit. On all the more advanced and more prosperous islands, and on all the more advanced estates there has been a reduction in the cost of production. I have had the figures of three typical Demerara estates given to me privately. On these estates, in 1886, the cost of production was £15 5s. per ton, while in 1901 the cost was reduced to £10 13s. per ton, or about 40 per cent., and it is hoped to reduce the cost of production still further in the near future. The cost of producing beet sugar has come down just in the same way, and may be put now at something between £9 and £10 per ton. I should like to know how anyone can fear, under these circumstances, that we shall go back to the old price of sugar. The Royal Commission were entirely agreed on this matter, and as their opinions have often not been fairly given or represented, I should like to quote them. They say:—

"It has, we believe, been argued that the reduction in the price of sugar, which has resulted from the bounty system, is such a source of gain to the British Empire, as a whole, that it would not be right for Your Majesty's Government to initiate any measures to bring about the abolition of that system. In that argument we do not concur. By far the greater portion of the fall in the price of sugar, which has conferred so great a boon on the consumer, is not due to the existence of bounties, and would not be lost if they were abolished. The fall in the price of sugar is mainly due to a lowering of the cost of production of both beet and cane sugar, and in so far as this is the case the abolition of bounties would not affect the price. . . . The benefit which the British Empire, as a whole, derives from any lowering of the price of sugar, due to the operation of the bounty system, is too dearly purchased by the injury which that system imposes on a limited class, namely, Your Majesty's West Indian and other subjects dependent on the sugar industry. . . . It is feared by some authorities that countervailing duties might cripple certain British industries. We doubt whether such a rise in price, as would result from them, would appreciably interfere with such trades as those of the jam, confectionery, and biscuit-makers, which depend upon cheap sugar."

The Royal Commission, therefore, were not the least afraid of those terrible consequences, and, as the result of that view, the Royal Commission made a statement which I did not hear from the right hon. Gentleman and which has often been entirely suppressed.

"The best immediate remedy for the state of things which we have shown to exist would be the abandonment of the bounty system by continental nations. This change would, in all probability, enable a large portion of the sugar-cane cultivation to be carried on successfully, and would certainly reduce the rate at which it will diminish."

I could quote Lord Farrar to the same effect, though I admit other utterances are to be found which do not agree. In 1897 he said to the Cobden Club—

"Upon that point (sugar bounties) we as Free Traders must walk warily; we must admit to the fullest degree that sugar bounties are an abomination, and we must not, because they make sugar a little cheaper in this country, say they ought to be continued. If Mr. Chamberlain were able in any fair way to get foreign nations to do away with their bounties we ought to wish him God-speed."

Then a question was put by the right hon. Gentleman opposite which I have already alluded to, namely, what is the use of abolishing bounties if it does not mean a large rise in price? No large rise in price is needed to make good estates pay. The present price is not much below the cost price, although it is probably below it. What is important is the abolition of the interference from bounties, which means security and confidence to the planter, and without which, as the Royal Commission testify, the industry can obtain no credit. With things as they are at present—it has been impossible in the more backward parts to get capital in order to provide proper machinery, and to get central factories established.

There is one point which the right hon. Gentleman raised, upon which I would like to say a word or two, and that is the memorandum of 1881 which was issued by the Board of Trade when the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies was at the head of that Department. The right hon. Gentleman read one sentence of that memorandum, but he did not read the sentence before or the sentence after. The sentence before shows that the state of the facts under which that memorandum was written was something entirely different from the state at the present day. The sentence is this—

"At present, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the effect of the alleged bounties given by foreign Governments has been to cheapen the price of sugar to the consumer in this country, while up to this time the general industry of sugar refining in the United Kingdom and of sugar production in the Colonies has not been seriously affected, though there has been some transfer of capital and labour from one branch of sugar refining to another."

Then comes the sentence read by the right hon. Gentleman. That sentence, I think, is rather double-edged considering the application it has to the agitation we have had outside of the House lately. Then at the end of what the right hon. Gentleman read comes this—

"At the same time the Government desired for all countries, as for this country, the establishment of a policy of complete free trade, believing that in the long run absolute non-interference with trade, whether by bounties or protective duties, is the system most conducive to general prosperity. They were accordingly desirous to advocate its adoption by all reasonable means, even in a case like the present, where the immediate effect of the bounties is to benefit this country at the expense of other nations."

Therefore the abolition of bounties was admitted as the ideal they were striving after. The condition of things as regards any injury having been done to refiners or producers of sugar was different, and the possibility of what could be done was different, because then no general agreement had been made by the great sugar producing countries, and if anything could have been done it would have been the bringing into force of countervailing duties in this country alone and without co-operation.

We have heard a great deal as to how a rise in price would affect the trades peculiarly interested. I think that the sentence the right hon. Gentleman quoted from the memorandum of 1881 is a sufficient answer, and that it is not necessary to pay too much attention to that. I do not believe for my part that a small rise—such a rise as could possibly follow the abolition of these bounties—could have a serious effect upon the great trades which are based upon cheap sugar. Letters were written ten years ago by certain great firms connected with the sugar industries in which they expressed their firm conviction that after a short interval this kingdom would be provided with a larger, better, cheaper, and more reliable supply of sugar. For that reason they at that time were not afraid of bounties being reduced. England will remain the great free market for sugar, and the price will be kept up abroad by surtaxes. I repudiate the claim to be guided by mere sectional interests. If you try to be so guided you certainly would be completely puzzled. You have the manufacturing confectioners denouncing those opposed to them as "a small group of West Indian sugar refiners and a few thousand West India planters." The Engineering Federation is very much interested in this question and in turn takes the other side. That Federation consists of 869 engineering firms, and in a circular which they issued lately they point out that on account of the bounties the manufacture of sugar machinery and plant had fallen off in this country. This diminution means a very large loss of money in wages in this country, amounting to many millions. But interests of this kind on the one side or on the other are trifling compared with the interests of the West Indies. There are hundreds of branches of engineering in which the manufacturers and workmen may take refuge, but in the West Indies matters are entirely different. There sugar is the staple industry, and it must continue to be cultivated in order that the people may make two ends meet. The welfare of the whole population of the islands, amounting to more than a million, and not that of a few absentee planters, as is sometimes represented, depends upon the sugar industry. These people have a special claim upon us to save them from ruin and starvation—whether they are representatives of the old slaves, or are East Indian subjects whom we have planted there for our own special interest. Many recommendations were made in the Report of the Royal Commission, and a vast deal has been done since then to develop other industries in the islands. But the industry that is best suited to the West Indies is the cultivation of sugar. We all lay claim to free trade principles, and if there is one outstanding free trade principle more than another, it is that each country in the world should cultivate that industry for which it is best fitted; and the West Indies are most fitted for the cultivation of sugar. It has been said that it would be cheaper to give these islands a bounty, and pension them off. This year a subsidy of £250,000 was made to them under special circumstances, but not without objection being made; and I should like to know what would be said if there was to be an annual vote of double that amount, which would be required if the sugar industry is allowed to die out.

Some people seem to imagine that the low prices we have at present are going to continue for ever, and that Germany and Austria will go on sending us sugar under the cost of production to the end of the chapter. That is a foolish idea, and is based upon the assumption that foreigners are fools. They are not fools. These countries are fighting for the monopoly of the British market, and are cutting rates. The object of the promoters of the Cartel is not to crush out the West Indies, for there the sugar industry is too small to be of any account to them, but to crush out France and the other European sugar-producing countries. There is so large an import duty on sugar in Germany and Austria that the Cartel is able to keep up the price of sugar in these countries to give the manufacturers a profit of £5 or £6 a ton upon the part of their production which is consumed at home. They are therefore able to sell below cost price the portion which they export and yet to make a good profit on this total production. It is perfectly certain that neither the Germans nor the Austrians, nor their Governments, desire, as a permanence, that we should have cheap sugar, and that the people of their own countries should pay an extravagant price for it. There is a very serious danger of prices being forced up if this monopoly is allowed to be established and France is driven out of competition. In that case, of course, the West Indies will have an undeserved benefit, as just now they are suffering an unmerited loss. I would like to know what hon. Gentlemen who cry out about raising the price of sugar would say in such a case. Meanwhile it is true we have been enjoying the accidental and temporary cheapness which is an incident in a great war of rates. So far we have no doubt benefited, but commercial peace and Free Trade is our permanent policy. It is wise to take this opportunity of concerted action, for if the monopolists of Germany and Austria should force up prices to the level desired by the Cartels, there is no one who would suffer so much as ourselves.

*(5.50.) SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): In my humble opinion this Brussels Convention is one of the most unfortunate fiscal and political instruments, from the point of view of this country, that has ever been drafted. It is one of the poorest pieces of statesmanship that can be imagined, as it will involve the maximum of cost with the minimum of gain. It will add to the cost of the food of the people, and tax the raw material of very important industries in this country, There is an additional aspect in which this conventionfails; itis not at all certain to achieve theobject intended, viz., to benefit the West Indies, while it will place the fiscal arrangements of this country very largely in the control of foreign nations. It will have the effect of relieving these foreign countries from substantial financial burdens, and from the clutches of monopolists, and cheapening the food of the masses of their people. It is no wonder, therefore, that some of these Powers are extremely anxious to have the Brussels Convention ratified, because they stand to gain by it, while we stand to lose. I hold that the action of the Government affords another illustration of the fact that the less this Government meddles with the trade of the country the better it is for that trade, for when they do meddle they usually do more harm than good, and for one ounce of benefit in one direction there is a ton of injury in another. I hold in respect to this Convention, that it would have been very much more in harmony with our dignity as a nation, and the strength of our Free Trade position if we had kept away from Brussels altogether. These foreign countries have got themselves into this mess through their bounties; therefore let them get out of it, and not, in return, drag us into it.

In my judgment, the fallacy upon which this Convention is based is that these sugar bounties are to be abolished to oblige us. If they are abolished, it must be shown clearly that they are abolished to oblige these foreign countries and not us. This country, in my opinion must adopt that fiscal policy which best suits itself, without regard to other nations. That is the reason why we adopted Free Trade, viz., that we judged it to be in our own best interests. And I hold it is the only safe plan for foreign nations themselves to exercise the same freedom without any interference on our part. On our side we say that bounties are a huge financial blunder on the part of those nations which give them, but it is not our business to say that to the foreigner, because if we tell him so he will naturally suspect us of having some interest in the matter. He must be convinced himself that they are a blunder, and when he has arrived at that conviction the bounties will go without any Convention, and we shall not be sorry when they disappear. In the German Reichstag last Friday, the Secretary to the Treasury drew a doleful picture of the finances of that Empire, and said that in his forthcoming Budget there would be a deficit of seven and a half millions, and when they remembered that it was caused largely by these sugar bounties, he thought that deficit would be a more convincing argument than all the Conventions in the world. The name of Free Trade has been invoked today to sanction two exactly opposite courses. This Convention has been described by a prominent member of the Government as a victory for Free Trade, but surely never before was victory so questionable. Never before was the cost so disproportionate to the advantages of victory. A victory for Free Trade, indeed! Where is the interest of Free Trade furthered as a result of this Convention? Our Free Trade will be less after this Convention than it was before. Nor will its effect be to increase Free Trade for those countries who are signatories to it, because they still maintain the right to continue their import tariffs. In the so-called Free Trade countries we must all agree that it is the unalienable right of every person to buy in the cheapest market. I know the right hon. Gentleman who introduced the proposal this afternoon discarded the theory of cheapness and substituted for it the theory of equality of opportunity, but does this Convention secure to those engaged in the sugar trade in this country equality of opportunity as compared with those engaged in the trade on the Continent. We know the surtax and import duties which will be maintained in those countries will effectually deny equality of opportunity to those engaged in the sugar industry here. The right hon. Gentleman prophesied boldly as to the course of prices during the next ten years. If business men could share the right hon. Gentleman's power of reading into the future they would not take long to accumulate substantial fortunes; but, unfortunately, we in business know that nothing is so unsatisfactory as to forecast the course of prices, for the unexpected usually happens. If the prophecy of the right hon. Gentleman is to be fulfilled, and during the next ten years prices are no higher on the average, I should like to inquire whether that range of values will suit the West Indies. Under this Convention which we are today asked to ratify, we are to be committed to the principle of countervailing duties in spite of the hostile report of the Commissioners sent out to the West Indies, and, by being so committed, we are *ipso facto* committed to a policy of retaliation. After resisting retaliation for fifty years, this Government has brought us to it at last. And what a topsy-turvy kind of retaliation it is. Retaliation, not for injuries done, but for benefits received. If a man chooses to sell his goods below cost to "A," and to recoup himself that loss by overcharging "B," it is obviously the duty of "B" to put a stop to that injustice. We are in the position of "A," and the foreigners, the bounty givers, are in the position of "B." This Convention, so far as I can read it, was not meant at all for us, because in it it is stated that the object of the Convention is to promote the consumption of sugar. Every one will agree that if the ratifying of this Convention and the carrying of it into effect is to influence prices at all, that influence will be in the direction of raising prices in this country, and if prices are raised here, it is obvious that instead of being increased, consumption of sugar will inevitably be diminished.

The Convention is said to be justified by the condition of the West Indies, but the West Indies in July last had a token of the substantial sympathy of this House. Will this Convention be certain to remedy the state of things in the West Indies? The Report relating to that matter contains this passage—

> "It is not clear if the bounties are abolished that another crisis of a similar character might not arise in the West Indies at some future day."

I hold it would be fifty times better to deal with the West Indies on their merits by grants in aid, and in pursuing that policy we should be greatly in pocket. Another objection has been urged. The West Indies at present have a preferential position in regard to the great market of the United States of America and this Convention will take it from them, and to that extent place them at a disadvantage.

But besides the West Indies, there is also the position of the British sugar refiner, which is closely affected by this Convention. I have felt sometimes that the case of the British refiner, is rather hard and that he suffers whilst the rest of the community benefit, but the condition of the British sugar refiner was considerably ameliorated last year when the sugar tax was introduced. I do not ask the House to accept my dictum with regard to that. There was a prospectus issued with regard to a sugar refinery at Liverpool last year which contained this statement—

> "Even under the old conditions considerable profits have been realised, but past figures are misleading as to what may be fairly expected under present favourable circumstances."

That referred, of course, to the sugar tax that had been introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which substantially improved the prospects and the position of the sugar refiners of this country; therefore I hope that the case of the sugar refiners is not so hard as it has been made out to be, and that, even without the assistance of this Convention, the prospects referred to in that prospectus will be amply fulfilled. I will not follow the right hon. Gentleman into the question as to what is a fair business profit, because I believe his views and the views of traders on the point would probably not agree. I believe bounties, have not been prompted by any desire to injure British sugar refiners, but by a jealous rivalry between France and Germany not to be ousted from British markets. Hence, when one country increases its bounties, its rivals feel bound to do the same. It is a policy of what may be called "Beggar-my-neighbour." But why should we be drawn into it, and by so doing upset our fiscal relations elsewhere?

So much for the West Indies and the British refiners who clamour for this Convention. In so far as they can establish their case, I would compensate them in other ways and be greatly in pocket.

But on the other side of the account there are incomparably greater interests in this country that are involved and will be penalised if this Convention is ratified. The consumers of sugar will lose many millions sterling per annum, and the sugar-using industries be considerably hampered by an increased taxation on their raw material, and we know that above a hundred thousand people are employed in these industries. In one paragraph of the Commissioners' report it says that

> "The abolition of the bounties was an object which should be aimed at, provided always that the sacrifice would not involve evils out of all proportion to those which it was desired to remove."

and it is because we say that the higher cost of sugar to forty million customers mostly very poor, is an evil out of all proportion to any which it is intended to remove that we are against the ratification. The gravest objection to the Convention is that it ties our hands in dealing with our Colonies and forces us into a course of action in regard to foreign nations which with a free hand we should probably be disinclined to follow. We are entitled to protest against the unconstitutional proposal of the Convention to take the power of taxing the British people out of the hands of the House of Commons and put it into the hands of a new-fangled Foreign Commission sitting in Brussels. This Commission may indeed turn the scales upon ourselves, because it is obvious that they will be able to call upon this country to take off the tax on sugar which was imposed in 1901, and which the Germans insisted at the time was tantamount to a bounty. We have enough to lose by this Convention without having our hands tied with regard to our Colonies. How foreign statesmen must stand aghast at the self-imposed condition that we are to give our Colonies no preference so long as the Convention lasts. What an extraordinary noose that is for us to put our necks into! Why it was only a few years ago that we paid a high price in order to obtain a free hand in our dealings with our Colonies—the price being the denunciation of our treaties with Belgium and Germany. And we are asked now to throw away this freedom once more. I am aware that the final protocol of the Convention professes to reserve in principle freedom of action in regard to our Colonies. But of what use is a principle which is violated in practice? This country has gained enormously by the avoidance of those tariff wars which have impoverished other nations. But the Convention will drag us into them. By it we shall be compelled to retaliate against Russia, the United States, Brazil, Egypt, Argentina, and probably Queensland. I believe the best way to avoid fiscal trouble and complications with other nations is to keep full control of our own tariff in our own hands. And it is because the Convention deprives us of that right that I am opposed to its ratification.

*(6.20.) MR. BONAR LAW (Glasgow, Blackfriars): The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Amendment began his speech by pointing out that there are heresies in trade just as there are heresies in religion. There is another analogy which the right hon. Gentleman omitted — namely, that there are superstitions in trade just as there are superstitions in religion, and it seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman attached to the expression "the most-favoured-nation Clause" a superstitious value which it does not deserve in practice. I was pleased to notice that the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down took an entirely different view, for he considered that we ought to make our own fiscal arrangements without having to refer to foreign nations.

Now, the arguments which have so far been directed against the proposals before the House are of two kinds—the theoretical, those based on what hon. Members opposite are pleased to call economic laws, and the practical, those based on what they consider will be the effect on particular industries in this country. The theoretical argument rests on the assumption that when a foreign country places a bounty on an article which is imported into this country it is really making us a present of the amount of the bounty, and that therefore we should assist them instead of trying to interfere with them in such a laudable practice. It assumes further that the nations which do that, do it not from any intentional generosity to us, but solely from ignorance of economic laws, which are so simple that they are well within the reach of the comprehension of every schoolboy throughout the country. That seems to me to be a pretty large assumption, and I cannot help thinking that if those who hold that view had visited, both before and after the introduction of the industry, those parts of Germany where the beetroot industry is most firmly established, if they had noticed the change in the face of the country and the improvement which has spread itself among the subsidiary industries which had sprung up in consequence, and if they had noticed further that owing to the difficulty of beetroot cultivation, and to the fact that only the most scientific methods are in use the whole system, of farming throughout the length and breadth of Germany has been improved, they would have agreed with my hon. friend the Member for the Partick Division, that perhaps these nations are not such simpletons as we think, and that possibly they know their own business a little better than we give them credit for. But I am not going to argue that. Let us even assume that these nations make a mistake, that bounties are a bad thing for them, must it inevitably follow that they are a good thing for us? If that is an economic truth it is true altogether; there are no exceptions; and I ask the House whether that is a theory we would carry to its logical conclusion. Take the iron industry; it is one of the most important industries of this country, but its relative importance has greatly changed of late. The United States now produce three times as much iron as we do. We know how that industry is controlled in the United States. It is in the hands of a few people, who are quite ready to use their power to crush competition. Suppose the same sentiment animated the United States Government and they were to say: "We have unlimited raw material, unlimited capital, unlimited labour. We should supply the world with iron goods, but Great Britain, which has not our natural advantages, competes with us in every market. Surely it would pay us, not merely for the encouragement of our own industry, but also to kill this competition, to offer a heavy bounty on all the iron goods exported." I do not say that that would be a good thing for the United States, but what would it be for us? Would hon. Members opposite say: "They are making us a present; we are quite ready to receive it, and the more the better?" What would become of our iron industry, and of the hundreds of thousands of workpeople directly or indirectly dependent on that industry for their livehood? Hon Members may say that that case has not arisen. I quite admit it, but we are talking of economic laws. If such a thing were to happen, the men connected with the iron industry and their fellow working-men throughout the country who sympathised with them would give this House a lesson in the elementary prinples of political economy which we would not easily forget. I fully admit that the lesson would be felt chiefly on this side of the House, because it so happens that the artisan electors have placed very few Members on the other side. So far as this Parliament is concerned, hon. Gentlemen opposite, if they represent anything, represent the agricultural interest, and it is possibly for that reason that they are assuming today an attitude which, on the authority of Mr. Gladstone himself, is entirely opposed to the principles of Free Trade.

If we could not allow a vital industry of this country to be destroyed by such causes, have we not exactly the same responsibility towards an industry of one of our colonies? In one sense I think the responsibility is greater. These Crown Colonies have not the power which the representatives of industries in this country have of making their views felt on the composition of this House. That is the case of the West Indies, and with the permission of the House I will read a sentence from a speech by the hon. Mr. Graf delivered in the West Indies, which gives very fairly, and I think not too strongly, the case for the West Indies in this matter—

> "Let me be well understood. The cane-sugar industry asks the British Government for no favour or special advantage. It must stand or fall on its own merits. But what we do ask the Government is to give us a fair field to fight the battle out squarely and fairly, and I hope and trust that the British nation will see this time that we get fair play. If not, God help the West Indies!"

I quite admit that to benefit the West Indies in the way they desire might mean that we would pay too high a price for it. That is the argument of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I will try to state his argument quite fairly. He says—

> "If you raise the price of sugar one halfpenny you inflict a loss of £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 on the people of this country. If you do not raise the price one halfpenny you do the West Indies no benefit at all."

If that were a true statement of the case I would say at once that the price was higher than we ought to pay. But it is not a true statement of the case. It leaves out of account, as such simple calculations generally do, what is, in my opinion, by far the most important factor. Take the two sides of this proposition. I do not for a moment believe that the price of sugar will be raised anything like a halfpenny by the abolition of these bounties. In proof of that view let me say that if the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken pleased, he could at the present moment buy beet-root sugar for delivery December next year, after the Convention is in force, at only one shilling per cwt. above its present price; and that shilling does not represent the difference which it is believed will be caused by this Convention; it is really very little more than the normal difference between current price and the price of delivery so far forward. The conclusion which we derive from the view of those who, after all, should know most about it, because they make their living by buying and selling, is exactly the conclusion at which we would come on general grounds. Why should there be such a rise in the price of sugar? The beet-root sugar producers are not going to stop at once. They are going to go through the experience that the West Indian planters have been going through. The stoppage will be gradual, and while the beet-root production is being gradually reduced the production of sugar cane is almost certain to be gradually increased.

This brings me to what I consider to be the element the right hon. Gentleman has left out. The West Indies have been brought to the verge of ruin not so much by the bounties, or the low price due to the bounties, as by the absolute uncertainty which they brought into the conditions of the trade. New capital, new energy, new enterprise, will never be put into a business unless there is a reasonable security about it, unless it has a fair chance. Was there such a fair chance under the conditions which existed before this Convention? Suppose, for instance, somebody said, "After careful calculation, I believe that by adopting the best machinery, following the most scientific methods, and using the utmost economy, even at the present price I can produce sugar at a profit," would he not be a fool to attempt it if he knew that by the time his machinery was in operation he might find that, from causes which he could not control, and which were purely arbitrary, the conditions had been completely changed and there was no possibility of making a profit at all?

I will refer to only one other aspect of the question, and that is the claim which the subsidiary industries—those of confectionery, and so forth—have in this matter. I confess I consider that claim unimportant, but it is solely owing to the action of the representatives of those trades that all this recent agitation has sprung up against the Convention. ["No."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite question that statement. Not only is it the cause of the agitation throughout the country, but it is the reason why the Party opposite as a Party have adopted their present attitude. In July last my right hon. friend introduced a subvention for the West Indies. He introduced that subvention on the ground that it was merely part of the general policy involved in the Sugar Convention. At that time not one Member of the Front Bench opposite spoke against the proposal, while the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Aberdeen actually said that though he was opposed to the grant as a grant, he would not oppose it as part of the policy of the Sugar Convention. As I have said, not one Member of that Bench voted against the subvention, and from the point of view of hon. Members opposite, I must say the hon. Member for West Islington is the hero of the debate. He has been consistent throughout and in July last year he brought forward exactly the arguments which are now being used by the Front Bench; but at that time he had to contend against not only this side, but also two of his own leaders. It must therefore now be a great satisfaction to the hon. Member to find that his leaders have at last fallen into line, and are following him. What is there in the complaints of the confectionery and other industries? I must confess I have not much sympathy with them—not because I would not sympathise with any trade, or would not be sorry to see any trade in this country injured, but because I know they are crying out before they are hurt, and because I believe they are crying out when they never will be hurt. Why should they be hurt, even after the Convention? They will get their sugar more cheaply than any other of the countries now competing with them, or at least as cheaply. If they cannot protect themselves under such circumstances, do hon. Members opposite wish us to raise a special protection fund for their benefit? But there is more than that. No one in this House, and none of the pamphlets on the subject, has mentioned what I should have thought was one of the first things these traders would mention. At present they export a large part of their manufactures to countries which are to be members of the Sugar Convention. The duties imposed against them are in some cases very high: I should have thought them almost prohibitive. But by the Convention it will be impossible for those countries to put a higher tax against them than 2s. 6d. a cwt. instead of nearly 20s. as in some cases at present, so that even if they have to pay a higher price for their sugar, that is some compensation for it.

Then there is another general consideration which I should have thought would have made them think that the Convention, after all, was not such a bad thing. If it is really true that their industries depend on these bounties, what a precarious foundation they have! At any moment the bounties might be taken away—although I quite admit that, without our intervention, it is not likely that that would happen. We cannot expect the Government of a country like Germany to rise at once to the serene economic atmosphere breathed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but they might get there by degrees. One of the first steps in that direction would be a very disastrous one to the subsidiary industries. Surely it would naturally occur to the Chancellor of the German Empire to say, "If it pays us to give a large bounty to encourage the export of raw sugar, it will pay us a great deal better to give a much bigger bounty for the encouragement of the manufactures of sugar. By that means we shall encourage not only the growth of sugar, but our own labour and industries." If they were to do that—and I am certain they would do it sooner or later—what would become of our confectionery, jams and other subsidiary industries? Where would the representatives of those industries be? It would not be difficult to answer the latter question. They would be in the lobbies, where so many of them have been lately, button-holing every Member they could, and urging him to leave no stone unturned to abolish these nefarious bounties.

*(6.42) MR. ROBSON (South Shields): The hon. Member has concluded his interesting and lucid speech with a suggestion, the fatal answer to which I should have thought he would have a once seen. He warned the trades that are protesting against this Convention that they might very well become subject to further bounties themselves—that is to say, to bounties operating against them by means of gifts to confectionery and other similar manufactures in the producing countries. Let the hon. Member consider for a moment what that kind of illustration leads him to. He has asked us to contemplate what would happen to us if there was an American bounty on exports of iron, or to English confectioners if there should be imposed a foreign bounty on confectionery and so on *ad infinitum*. But long before the serious consequences were reached there would be another cause operating. For instance, take Germany,

with the suggested bounty on confectionery. Germany is already staggering under the weight of her existing bounties; she already has to meet a serious difficulty and yet the hon. Gentleman tells the confectionery trade that it had better take care, because the policy which without this intervention has broken down with regard to sugar, will by Germany be extended with regard to confectionery. That is the class of illustration with which the hon. Gentleman seeks to intimidate the protesting trades of this country. He began his remarks by saying the suggestions put forward from this side were two-fold—first, that the foreigners made us a present, and secondly, that they did it from economic ignorance. Those were the two statements that he put into our mouths, and which he seemed to think were not practical arguments. But what did he say about them? Having stated them, he straightway left them, except to contend that foreigners were not such fools as we thought them. The inference from that observation is that there was some good reason for their bounties. How is it, if they are not such fools as we think them, that they are so anxious to get rid of their bounties? The hon. Gentleman opposite has stated what our objections are, but he has never met them. Foreigners are, in fact, making us a present, and they are doing it from economic ignorance, because they have found out that their economic policy is mischievous to themselves, and they have come to our Government to relieve them from the very worst consequences of their policy. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down did not defend these bounties on the grounds of Free Trade. I must say that one is always astonished to see the way in which hon. Members opposite treat the principles of Free Trade in controversies of this kind. At one time we are told that they do not regard Free Trade as a fetish, and they say that the principles of Free Trade are old shibboleths and antiquated and economic prejudices, and then, having laid down these principles when they introduced a fiscal change, they try to show that it is in strict accord with all the principles of Free Trade. If Free Trade is really economic pedantry and old shibboleths, surely we need not have the President of the Board of Trade so anxious to prove that this proposal is a Free Trade method.

Every step of this kind taken by the present Government within the last few years has been treated as though it were consistent with the principles of Free Trade. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer revived an export duty upon coal while claiming, at the same time, to be a free trader. Then he went on to increase the sugar and bread tax in a way that gave a differential advantage to the English miller and sugar refiner in this country, and he claimed, nevertheless, to be a free trader. One really wonders what are the ideas of the Tory Party with regard to Free Trade. The Government come before us now, gravely proposing to hamper one of our greatest industries by irritating inquiries into the local origin of imported goods, and they do it in the name of Free Trade. They propose to put heavy tariff duties upon an imported article, and they do this in the name of Free Trade. They seem to think that by doing this they are helping the nations of Europe by some educational process of retaliation towards a comprehension of Free Trade. And last of all, they put our trade regulations under the control of a foreign Commission, and they do this also in the name of Free Trade. The idea among hon. Gentlemen opposite seems to be this—bounties are contrary to Free Trade, and retaliatory duties will stop bounties, therefore retaliatory duties are in favour of Free Trade. That seems to me to be a pretty syllogism; but, unfortunately, where it is not incomplete it is inaccurate.

Of course nobody doubts that bounties are opposed to principles of Free Trade, but will retaliatory duties stop them? As a matter of fact they did not stop them in the case of Russia and America. America put on countervailing duties against Russia, and Russia responded by putting a maximum tariff on American machinery. Countervailing duties did not stop bounties in the case of India. [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.] We have heard that practically admitted this afternoon. Why did these duties not stop bounties in India? For the very same reason that will operate in the case of these bounties. The President of the Board of Trade explained to us the two-fold disadvantage under which our sugar refining trade lies. First of all he referred to the direct advantage of the bounty given by the Government, but there is another advantage which the foreign producer gets which is perhaps more serious; for he obtains what is called the Cartel system, which depends not upon a direct bounty but upon a Protective duty. Germany and France have a surtax on sugar. They charge so much by way of excise duty and so much by way of Customs duty in order to prevent the importation of sugar into their countries. That surtax is to be retained under this Convention, the object of the Convention being to preserve the Protective system of those countries. It is by means of the surtax that the Cartel system operates. In this way you get a syndicate which will never be subject to competition from abroad, and they protect themselves at home by means of combination, and with security from that competition they are able to raise the price against the home consumer and lower the price for export. Therefore the Cartel system will remain in spite of this Convention.

The President of the Board of Trade gave some figures which struck me as being very instructive. He said that there was a difference of about 3s. in one country and about 4s. 4d. in another by way of advantage under the Cartel system arising from the surtax. Therefore, although the abolition of bounties will raise the price in England, it will still leave an advantage to the foreign exporter as against the English refiner and the West Indian exporter, who will get very little benefit indeed from this Convention. I think, however, that the best way of treating the argument in favour of the Convention is to assume that the retaliatory duties will succeed to this extent, namely, that they will prevent the granting of bounties. Is it certain that if they do succeed to this extent they will therefore advance the cause of Free Trade? This Convention is expressly founded upon Protection. This Convention is a Protective document. Although we are to go on giving to Germany, France, and other Protecting countries the free run of our sugar market, yet we are not to have the free run of theirs. There is to be a Customs duty set up against us, and that is to be fixed at such a figure as any nation may consider sufficient for the protection of its own sugar industry. Just consider what that means. The German refiner has hitherto had bounties from his Government. Instead of getting bounties he will henceforth get a somewhat enhanced price from the English consumer, and it will be something about equivalent to the bounty which he previously got from the German Government. The first result of this Convention will accordingly be that the English consumer will pay more for his sugar in order to save the German exchequer. The German exchequer will consequently save a considerable amount, and the equivalent to the German producer is to be the increased price paid by the English consumer. This does not seem to me much like a triumph for British diplomacy. Heaven help us if our trade and the livelihood of our industrial population are to be placed at the mercy of that kind of diplomacy.

We have already had the German coal owner receiving a handsome bounty at the expense of the English producer, and now, apparently, the German exchequer is also to receive some benefit. Why should this relief be given to the German and French exchequers at a time when our own taxation has been burdened so much? This does not seem a favourable opportunity for us to put this additional burden on our people in order to save the exchequers of foreign countries. One might describe this as altruism run mad if it were really intended to be altruistic, and if it were intended to benefit Germany and draw that country towards Free Trade. I do not think that it is intended to draw Germany towards Free Trade, but the intention is to draw England towards Protection. The present Government have succeeded in doing what a few years ago would have been considered impossible. The signature of England has been attached to an international affirmation in favour of Protection. This Convention has been founded upon the right of each nation to protect its own market against the others by hostile tariffs; therefore it is not an unimportant circumstance that England should put its name to an international declaration of a Protectionist character. There is already a Free Trade Party, or, at least, the beginnings of one, both on the continent of Europe and in America, and that Party looks to England for example and encouragement.

I do not suppose that the governing class of any country in the world will take the trouble to master Free Trade as an abstract doctrine. Free Trade is more easily believed in if somebody else believes in it and practises it, and no doubt the principles of Free Trade throughout Europe and America have been greatly advanced by the devoted adhesion of England to Free Trade. That is now all at an end. If Protection were abandoned as a whole I think there would be a great deal to be said in favour of opposing these bounties, but Protection is not going to be abandoned as a whole. The policy of the Government is not to attack Protection as a whole, because the effect of this Convention is rather to preserve Protection. I think, Sir, that the English Government might very well leave Protectionist countries to see and feel the results of their own policy. They are beginning to see these results in the case of bounties which rest upon the same kind of fallacy as Protective duties. When once they have found out the results in the case of bounties they are very likely to find out the result in the case of Protective duties.

Why on earth should we arrest that healthy process? The Government might remember that "It's an ill wind that blows nobody good." Well, the ill-wind of Protection, bad as it is, blows us some good. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] The hon. Member says "No." Consider what the position of England is as to these bounties. England sits at her open ports to receive an enormous tribute from all those foreign nations. Can any nation pay a more humiliating tribute to another? It is the tribute of economic ignorance. But the new economy, aided, I suppose, by the new diplomacy, rejects the tribute, and does it in order to preserve the general system of Protection. By all means let us fight Protection, but let us fight it altogether. Don't let us seek to protect it against itself. Don't let us try to save it from punishment while suffering it to remain. Hon. Members opposite may say: "What is your method of dealing with the bounties? The Government have chosen the Protective method; what is the proper method?" It is by the method of Free Trade, which has brought those nations to our door seeking to be relieved from the results of their folly. In the words of Sir Robert Peel, the best way of fighting hostile tariffs and bounties is by open ports, and that is the Free Trade method. I suppose that method now is to be relegated by the Colonial Secretary to the limbo of old shibboleths. Well, it is the method by which we stand. You cannot defeat hostile tariffs by imitating them, and still less by this fatuous proposal to assist them by relieving them of their own consequences. When Protection begins to feel the results of its own folly, let us not try to save it from punishment by confirming it in its errors. Some hon. Members seem to think that Free Trade is a helpless sort of thing—a thing with no kind of fighting value. That was not the belief of the great masters of Free Trade when they laid down the great principle that the best way to fight hostile tariffs was by open ports. I do not know that it would be proper at the present time to go into the abstract reasons in favour of that maxim, but, at all events, one may appeal to the experience we have had of this policy. In the last fifty years every nation of Europe has been engaged in a tariff war with every other, and today the unquestioned commercial supremacy rests with the one nation which has kept Free Trade as its defence and its weapon. There has no doubt been an absolute expansion of trade in Protectionist countries, but when you come to consider the price they have paid for it, and to look at their deficits, you will see whether the Free Trade principle has not been more efficient. You have in Germany a great population, and a better educated one, we are told, than our own. You have in France a more thrifty population than our own; and you have in America a population with every kind of natural advantage and absolutely incomparable natural resources. Yet America is not able to displace us in the sphere of international trade, great as her home trade is. Of course, if you look simply at a single trade and keep your eyes fixed on that trade, such as sugar refining at home and sugar growing in the West Indies, there may seem to be some plausibility in the reasons for retaliatory duties. The Under Secretary to the Board of Trade rather fell into the error of keeping his eyes upon the West

Indies and the sugar refining industry only. We have to look beyond that. When we are invited to reverse a whole policy we must look at the industries which have gained as well as to the industries which have lost. The industry which has lost in this case consists of about 12 firms employing 5,000 men. What are the industries that have gained? Why! there seems to be no end of them. They employ something like 250,000 men. Surely we ought to consider that comparison before we throw away the advantage brought to us by the economic folly of other nations. We ought above all to consider our own trade policy and preserve it intact. If we are going to modify it, don't let us throw it aside in points that punish our opponents and benefit us. Until the nations of Europe are willing to open their ports to Great Britain let us keep the benefit of their bounties, not only because of their material benefit, but because of the stern practical lesson they are teaching to the nations which are foolish enough to give them.

*(7.8.) MR. JAMES REID (Greenock): I should like to say a few words on the subject of the sugar refiner, that much ill-used individual of whom so much has been said today. In the constituency I have the honour to represent nearly a half of the residuum of refiners who are left to us in the kingdom have their location. The town of Greenock for 130 years has been the leading sugar refining port, doing a large and prosperous business with the West Indies until it was ruined by these bounties. Hence we have in the town such names as Jamaica Street, Tobago Street, Antigua Street, and others, showing that in former times there was a connection with the West Indies which unhappily has in a great measure passed away. Of the twelve sugar refineries in the United Kingdom five are in my constituency, but these are not continuously working, I am sorry to say. At the same time, they are not by any means standing idle. Not so many years ago we had fourteen sugar houses in Greenock. We have been told by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that it is an insignificant industry, but it was not so until these bounties crippled it, and even now the numbers employed are not a correct indication of the employment which the sugar industry gave for many years. Thousands of engineers have been thrown out of employment, and engineering shops have been closed, because there is no longer a demand for the refining machinery. There is not so much employment at the harbour for workmen as there would be if the sugar refining trade had continued as brisk as it was in former times. We are accused of being Protectionists. The late Lord Farrar has been quoted. He at one time would not assist in any way in abolishing bounties, but he described them latterly as "an abomination, bad and foolish things, revolting to his conscience." Mr. Gladstone has been quoted. He said to a deputation of working men in the early '80's—

> "My desire is that the British consumer should have both sugar and every other commodity at the lowest price at which it can be procured without arbitrary favour to any of those engaged in the competition. But I cannot regard with favour any cheapness which is produced by means of concealed subsidies of a foreign state to a particular industry, and with the effect of crippling and distressing capitalists and workmen engaged in the lawful branch of British trade."

Is that Protection, may I ask? The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, who possibly may have, like many another man, changed his opinion as time went along, said on one occasion—

> "I say it would be impossible to find in the writings of any of those who advocate Free Trade any justification for the theory that bounties given in the way in which these bounties are given by Foreign Powers to the detriment of British producers cannot in some way be countervailed. My opinion of the bounty system I have never concealed, and I think that those Free Traders are very imprudent who contrive to identify the doctrine of Free Trade with the support of this abominable bounty system. The bounty system is inconsistent with Free Trade, and hostile to Free Trade, and it ought to be, I think it must be, I think it will be, soon abolished."

A stalwart advocate of Free Trade, Sir Charles Cameron, formerly a Member of this House

> "hoped the Cabinet would put an end to a system which for forty years statesmen had deplored and lamented."

I think I have proved that little bit of my case, at any rate. The confectioners claim to consume 400,000 tons. We grant they may, but that only represents one-fourth of the consumption.

Whence, therefore, their right to dictate, and whence their mandate to speak, as they try to do, for the 41,000,000 of our population? They want to pose as philanthropists, but their philanthropy does not go one inch further than their own pockets. At the Birmingham Trades Council Mr. Davies, a Member of the Cobden Club said—

> "We have met to-night, not to advocate the principle of Protection, as it would have been impossible for me to be present under circumstances of that character. I have the honour to be a life member of the Cobden Club, and I am a Free Trader, and I appear on this platform as a Free Trader advocating the abolition of the foreign sugar bounties. We are here to-night not to ask the State to fix a fiscal incubus, but to remove a fiscal incubus which has practically ruined the great sugar industry."

Mr. Davies concluded as follows:—

> "Now it appears to me that the greatest sinner of any in this matter is France. It is said that if only France would yield, then all other nations would follow. If that be so it seems to me that the Government should use its powerful influence with France in order that Free Trade with respect to sugar may be declared."

The Glasgow Chamber of Commerce in a memorial to Lord Salisbury in 1899, said that

> "The business of sugar importing, sugar refining, manufacturing sugar into confectionery, jams, pastry, etc., is large and important in Glasgow, and the West of Scotland; and their cognate trades—such as sugar making, sugar machinery for use at home and for exportation, furnishing coals for refining and manufacturing sugar, and its sea and land carriage, etc.—are of more importance here than in any other district with which this Chamber is acquainted. This Chamber has examined and given most careful consideration to the question of the effect upon British interests of the sugar bounties paid by foreign Governments, and is unanimously of opinion that these bounties have worked, and are working, great evils to the sugar trade and inter-related trades of this country, as well as vital injury to many British Colonies and Dependencies."

M. Martineau, who was present at the late Brussels Conference, in an able article in the current number of the *New Liberal Review*, entitled "Free Trade in Danger," says, referring to the Paris Conferences of 1876–7:—

> "Twenty-two years have elapsed since the report of the Select Committee, and bounties still go merrily on. Every attempt to abolish them has been met and defeated by the false cry of 'Free Trade in Danger.' It is those who have raised the cry who are really guilty of jeopardizing the maintenance of those essential principles of Free Trade which have played such a large part in the former greatness and prosperity of our country. Woe to them, and woe to our commercial supremacy, if they persist."

Mr. Yves Guyot, editor of the *Siècle*, last May read a paper before our Royal Statistical Society, and in the discussion which followed he quoted Sir Robert Giffen, who in 1879–80 was a strong defender of bounties, and had since said as follows, in manfully recanting his former opinions:—

> "He was not sure that he would have taken the same line if he had been able to look forward a quarter of a century and see what the result was to be of allowing these bounties to continue. People became wiser as time went on, and a good many of the assumptions which it was perhaps legitimate to make a quarter of a century ago had been falsified by events. But having had a quarter of a century's more experience, he was satisfied that these bounties must be treated as a great infraction of Free Trade, and that all the countries affected by them were quite entitled to take exceptional measures to put an end to them. Whatever we might gain temporarily in consequence of what foreign countries gave us by these bounties, they were not to be endured, and we should join in the general movement in favour of Free Trade."

As to mineral waters, I spoke to a manufacturer as to what would be the effect of the abolition of the bounties on his trade, and he said it was all "fudge." The cost of the bottle, cork, and wire was twopence, and of the contents one farthing, and that the mineral water manufacturers lost more money in wrangling amongst themselves about filling one another's bottles than by the bounties. No trade deserves to exist which requires its raw material under cost price; or at any rate to drive a legitimate trader out of his business. What is wanted is a fair field, no favour, and an open door for imports and exports. I am aware it is said that the machinery and appliances of modern sugar refiners are not up to date. I am authorised to give that an unqualified denial, and to challenge inspection. If they are beaten in fair, honest, open competition, British sugar refiners will own it; but if beaten in unfair competition, and by nefarious bounties, they demand justice. In spite of reduced prices, increased consumption did not follow. For instance, the average price of sugar from 1872 to 1885 was 28s. 10d. per cwt. with an average increase of consumption of 32,000 tons; but from 1886 to 1898, when the average price was 16s. per cwt. the increase was only 19,000 tons. My contention is "Let justice be done, though the heavens should fall."

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: I rise to speak on this question in a clear and business-like way; but I should like to know whether it is perfectly true that the Government intend to make this measure a question of confidence. I thought that these subjects should be discussed in a free and open way, although my hon. friend below me says, "No, not at all." If the Government tell us that if in discussing this question they are beaten they shall go out of office, what is the good of our discussing this matter at all, even though it is a most vital one? We are entirely dependent on sugar grown abroad, because we cannot produce sugar in this country. The working man is the great consumer of sugar in this country, and what we have to consider is whether he can or will pay a largely increased price for that article of food. This is not altogether a question of whether bounties are carried to excess. The West Indies are only sending to us less than 50,000 tons of sugar a year, whereas we require 1,700,000 tons from the Continent and other parts of the world. It is all very well for refiners to say that they are being injured by the bounties. One would think that the refiners were doing a bad business, but look at the Tate and other sugar refining companies! I find that in 1871 600,000 tons of raw sugar were refined in England, whereas last year the amount refined was 625,000 tons, or an increase of 25,000 tons over what was then regarded as the most successful year of the trade. It is absurd to say that the refiners are suffering because of the bounties. Hon. Members who represent important working-class constituencies must be aware that the working men will rise against a proposal which is to increase the price of a staple article of food for themselves and their children by a halfpenny per pound. It seems to me that the Government is very ill-advised in bringing forward this matter at this time, which would need for its adequate discussion four or five days.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned. Debate to be resumed this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [this day], "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out all the words after the word 'House,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'declines to approve of the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902.'"—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question again proposed "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question." Debate resumed.

(9.0.) SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: For the last forty years this subject has been engaging the attention of the country. Conventions have been entered into, and there was a Bill introduced into Parliament to enable the Government to carry into effect the Convention of the 13th August, 1888. With some other Members of Parliament, I, at that time, foresaw the enormous importance of the matter. It is true that there was a great amount of agitation got up by the refiners. I went down into my constituency, having previously communicated with Lord Salisbury and other members of his Cabinet, and delivered a speech, a report of which was sent to Lord Salisbury. The Bill afterwards disappeared from the Orders of the Day. But it was evidently the Bill which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade has it in his mind to bring forward next Session. I cannot understand why the Government should wish to rush this important matter through, seeing that Parliament has been specially summoned in order to deal with the

Education Bill and the London Water Bill. This measure is of the utmost importance. The President of the Board of Trade says his idea is not to have countervailing duties, but he proposes to proceed on the lines of the Bill which was withdrawn.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! There is no Bill before the House at present, and the hon. Member must not argue on a Bill which has been withdrawn.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: We have been told that a Bill is to be brought in next Session, and my object is to show the similarity which must exist between the two Bills. We are asked to pass this Motion tonight after only a few hours discussion, and if the Bill is to be thrown at our heads in that manner surely we ought to try and get at the meaning of it. We ought to have a Commission thoroughly to inquire into the subject. It is a most serious step to interfere with the course of trade. It seems to me that, instead of asking foreign Governments to take off their bounties, it would be far better if we gave a bounty, not only to the West Indies, but to India, Canada, Queensland, and other places to produce sugar for us. Otherwise, one of these days we shall be thrown entirely on the Continent for our sugar. At the present time Continental countries are making more sugar than is required. In Germany there was in stock on the 1st August this year 590,000 tons of sugar as compared with 258,200 tons last year, and no doubt if this Bill becomes law English consumers will have to pay a higher price for their sugar. The policy of the Government of saying to the persons from whom we buy, "You are not charging enough; put the price up," is altogether beyond a commercial man's understanding. We consume 1,700,000 tons annually, but only about one-fortieth of that comes from the West Indies. It is the working classes of this country who would suffer. It is, in my opinion, a false policy, and I am sure we shall deeply regret it. I cannot support the Government on this occasion. I would like to make a sporting offer to take the opinion of a London constituency on the subject.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): We are here tonight on a very important occasion. By the time the evening has passed the Colonies will have a charter for freedom of cultivation such as for the past fifty or sixty years they have never enjoyed. Hon. Members opposite have been so intent upon interests that specially concern their constituencies that they cannot look beyond to the larger questions which concern the Empire. It is the case that for the last sixty years the West Indies have never had the opportunity of advancing their staple cultivation without unfair competition. As far back as 1848 Free Trade compelled them to compete with slave-grown sugar in the Brazils and the United States. They had no sooner got over the effects of that competition than they were face to face with this bounty question, which, beginning about 1860, has become extremely active in the last twenty-five years. I shall be surprised if, after hearing the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich, he does not go with me into the lobby. The hon. Baronet pointed out that the West Indies now send only 40,000 tons of sugar to this country. Why is that? It is because they cannot get fair play in the market of the mother country, and they go to America because the Americans have long since seen the injustice of this bounty system, and have anticipated it by putting on countervailing duties against the system. It is an extraordinary fact that through all the years of this treatment the loyalty of the West Indies has never been doubted, and I am sure that though they have suffered so much they will readily forget the past, and look forward to a fair and reasonable future. The West Indies do not wish to have their produce enhanced; they ask for justice. They have no sympathy with the policy of doles—they absolutely repudiate that principle. They desire only to grow sugar. They will stand the uncertainty of the trade; they are convinced that they have climate, soil, and enterprise in their favour; and if they have not now the capital they will have it by their own credit, as long as it can be shown that under a fair system capital will get its reward. They do not ask for doles—only for fair treatment. I do not believe, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, that the population of this country is only concerned in the £ s. d. of the matter; in fact I was very much surprised with the way in which the right hon. Gentleman treated this question. The West Indies only ask for fair play, and not for preference. They want to grow their commodities, and are prepared to stand the rub of the market. It is absurd to think that the price of sugar can become to any appreciable extent higher than it has been during the last ten years. If the Convention comes into force, they have, whether for beet or cane, the full powers of production of the tropical and temperate zones to supply the sugar market, and I affirm that it is beyond the bounds of possibility—although I am not so ready as some hon. Members opposite to prophesy what is going to happen—that with that wide field of production open to them, the price of sugar can rise to any considerable extent. It must also be remembered that owing to the depression of the cane sugar industry they have not been able to make those improvements in cultivation and in the science of manufacture that have been possible in the case of beet under artificial and Government aid. It may well be that in the course of the next few years, when they can afford to borrow money with fair expectation of adequate return, we shall find the processes in cane sugar industry enormously improved. The hon. Member for the Rotherham Division seems to think that this great change will not benefit the mother country. As an agriculturist here at home I am in a position to say that I fully believe we should be able to grow beet in this country. For several years I have gone through the process of beet cultivation here, and it has been carefully tried in different parts of the country, and I believe the possibilities of turning out beet capable of bearing a high saccharine return are very great. When we consider that the proportion of the return on cane is only something like one-sixth more than that on beet per acre, that the growth of cane takes about eighteen months against only a year for beet, and the great distance and consequent freight charges which cane has to sustain in carriage, we may fairly conclude that there will be no more interesting economic question lying in front of us than that as to whether beet or cane will be the better product in the long run. I am prepared to say that if we can only grow beet in this country we shall see many of our poor country districts, which now find very great difficulty in making ends meet, improve in the same way that has been the case in Germany and Austria. When we consider the enormous tracts of ground in different parts of the world only waiting for capital to see a possibility of remunerative return to be thrown into cultivation, it is certain that there will be an enormous increase in the growth of cane sugar, which will bring an increased prosperity to all the subsidiary industries, such as shipping and machinery construction, dependent upon it.

I speak not merely as interested in the West Indies, and as an English agriculturist, but I speak officially on behalf of the refiners of Liverpool. I will leave the matter of refining to my colleagues who are specially conversant with the case, but I would like to say this, in case time prevents them being called upon, that it is not the case that the refiners have made any gain owing to the arrangement of the duties by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. Under this Convention, if carried out, assuredly we shall have a wider area from which to draw the most important staple of sugar than is open to any other staple on the face of the globe. Another point is that this Convention is nothing new. There is a precedent for it. It is exactly analogous to the case of the Cobden treaty thirty or forty years ago. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for South Shields affirmed that the quiet example of this country in favour of Free Trade was drawing others to follow us. I never heard a more preposterous statement coming from a gentleman so well informed as he usually is. What are these countries that are following our example? The French Minister, in speaking on that subject, described the Convention as a work of peace. In the face of that opinion we need not fear the criticism of those who think that in any sense we are going back upon the doctrines of Free Trade in this country, under which the country has for a long time distinctly flourished. I am a strong supporter of those who desire that such commodities as can be most easily grown shall be most freely exchanged, and because I feel that for many a long year the great industry of the West Indies has been cribbed, cabined, and confined by the selfish and ignorant policy of the mother country, I welcome this day the action of the Government, and I am willing to forget the past in looking forward to the future.

*(9.34.) MR. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): I do not propose to take up more than a few minutes of the time of the House; but I should like to say a few words on this very interesting and important subject. I listened to the speech of the President of the Board of Trade, and I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the principal reason for the ratification of the Convention was that the sugar planters in the West Indies ought to have a reasonable margin of profit. He said further that if they got £10 a ton for their sugar that would be a reasonable margin. I am connected with manufacture, and I should like to be also guaranteed a reasonable margin of profit. There are plenty of trades in this country at present whose margin of profit is very small; and many of the shareholders of these trading companies think that it is not in any way reasonable. If the right hon. Gentleman will inquire into the position of the cotton mills in Lancashire, he will see that the margin of profit is very small indeed; and that, in some cases, it is non-existent. I do not know whether this is a new development of the right hon. Gentleman's Department, or whether he is prepared to say that all trades in the country are to have a reasonable margin of profit. If so, all interested in trade will be very pleased to hear it. I understood from the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, that they can grow sugar in Cuba at £6 to £7 per ton, which will give the growers a profit. If we are trying to guarantee the growers in the West Indies a profit at £10 per ton, surely we shall be guaranteeing the sugar planters in Cuba something more than a "reasonable margin of profit." The President of the Board of Trade said that he did not expect that during the next ten years the price of sugar would be above the average for the last ten years. What, in that event, will be the good to the Colonies of ratifying the Convention? I think, however, we have a better authority than the President of the Board of Trade in regard to this matter. We have the authority of Sir Henry Norman, and he tells us that if the Convention is ratified, he expects that sugar will be ½d. a lb. more than at the present time. That means, on the consumption of sugar in this country, a sum of between £7,000,000 or £8,000,000. One-third of the sugar imported into this country is used in manufacture—in the confectionery and mineral water trades—and, therefore, these trades will have to pay one-third of the £7,000,000. I wonder whether the President of the Board of Trade will guarantee the confectionery and mineral water trades a reasonable margin of profit if the price of sugar increases. The other two-thirds of the sugar imported is used by the general consumer who are the working classes principally. They will have to pay two-thirds of the £7,000.000, and we all know that many of the working classes cannot afford to pay anything more than they are paying at present. In several large towns it has been shown that something like 30 per cent. of the population is living on the borders of poverty; and I think it is a great shame that we should impose this extra tax on the working classes. We are asked to run the risk of having to pay seven to eight millions more for our sugar for the sake of assisting the West Indies whose total export of sugar only amounts to about three millions sterling. I believe something like five-sixths of the sugar exported from the West Indies goes to the United States. The United States puts a countervailing duty on bounty-fed sugar; and I should have therefore thought that the West Indies had already got what they wanted. If the bounties are removed, then the West Indian planters will have to compete with continental sugar growers; and I am afraid that their position will be worse than it is at present. The argument of the Government on this occasion is somewhat contrary to some of their arguments in the past. When they put a duty on coal they told us the foreigner would pay it; and when they put a duty on imported wheat they told us again that the foreigner would pay it. But we on this side of the House were uncertain as to whether the foreigner would pay these duties. We know that in this case the foreigner gives us between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000 by selling sugar under cost price; and I think that, when we have a certain gift like that we ought to accept it with open

arms. I am an Imperialist, like the Colonial Secretary was in 1881 when he said—

> "Our policy had been for many years to prefer the large consuming interest of the whole community to the small producing interest of any single class."

That is why I intend to vote against the Motion.

(9.42.) MR. CUST (Southwark, Bermondsey): I venture to ask the brief indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I endeavour to explain why I feel a great difficulty in giving my vote in favour of this Convention. In doing this, I wish to go back, for a few moments, to some of the facts which have been stated by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down; because, if I may say so with great respect, the facts cannot be too often presented to the House. Now, Sir, we suffer manifestly and obviously in every direction from the effects of foreign protection; and it seems to me to be perfectly amazing that the only action we propose to take with regard to foreign protection should be directed against the only form of foreign protection which is directly beneficial to us. We all know very well what the position of agriculture is. What has our diplomacy done to help it? Is English wheat of less importance than West Indian sugar? Again, a Committee is sitting upstairs to inquire into the gigantic shipping subsidies granted by foreign Powers, which are mainly and almost avowedly directed against our maritime supremacy; but no Government has yet thought fit to enter into diplomatic relations and to use their influence in its strongest way in order to reduce the unfair competition under which our shipping has laboured, and is likely to labour still further in the future. It is absolutely only in this case of sugar that the British consumer derives great benefit from the strange methods of foreign finance; and it is only in this case of sugar that Government after Government, since 1863 onwards, have called Conference after Conference in order to strain every nerve to get rid of the great advantages which foreign finance gives us. It would seem that our diplomacy has by an unaccustomed effort at last aroused France, Germany, and Austria to a sense of the lavish generosity with which, in this particular, they have been treating us. We may take it on trust that France, Germany, and Austria never intended to do so; and we might surely have left the fact to themselves to discover.

At the risk of brevity, and at some risk of repetition, let me ask the House how does the case stand now, and how will this Convention affect it? I speak as one not interested in any part of the sugar trade, not as an expert, but merely as a commonplace Member of Parliament. We are all agreed that after bread-stuffs, sugar, in all its forms, is the most important item in the food of the people. We know that from patent blacking upwards it enters in a hundred ways into the daily life of men and women. We know that twenty trades depend on it, and that more than 200,000 hands are directly or indirectly engaged in dealing with it. In 1900 the sugar exported from this country, excluding, of course, all consumption within the United Kingdom, amounted to over two and a quarter million pounds sterling. But it is not necessary to go very far into facts and figures which are probably familiar to most hon. Members, and which, indeed, have been already quoted. In round numbers we import 1,600,000 tons of sugar, and of this we take 1,500,000 tons from the bounty paying countries, or 92 per cent. of the whole bulk. Further, we import on the other hand some 40,000 tons from our West Indian possessions, or only 2½ per cent. of our total sugar supply. By the effect of these bounties, direct and indirect, England gets sugar extraordinarily cheap, and I understand, from what I believe to be good authority, that we can buy sugar in London now at from 9s. to 10s. per cwt. which in Germany, the country of its growth and origin, would cost 29s. or 30s. per cwt. These are the advantages which this country enjoys under the existing system. I do not think that the debate tonight will result in palming off doctrines of Free Trade and Protection. The issue is sufficiently clear. What we have to consider, in the sheer commercial interests of the country, is what we stand to gain, and what we stand to lose by any alteration in the present system. It is calculated by Sir Henry Norman, who was Chairman of the very Select Committee appointed to inquire into the whole subject, in his Minority Report, that if we were foolish enough to impose countervailing duties against foreign bounties and if those duties had the desired effect (I quote his own words)—

> "The people of the United Kingdom will have to pay more for their sugar than they do at present, perhaps to the extent of ½d. a lb.

We may, therefore, put at that figure the amount which foreign bounties, as they now exist, and as paid exclusively by the foreigner, deduct from the price we pay on 92 per cent. of the sugar we consume. That is to say, if the bounties were abolished the people of this country would have to pay, on Sir Henry Norman's calculation, ½d. a lb. more for their sugar; and it may be remembered when we talk of sugar that every man, woman, and child in the United Kingdom consumes annually per head some 90 lbs. of sugar. Therefore, this additional imposition cannot be classed as a negligeable quantity. Now, supposing this calculation to be accurate, or anything in the least like accurate, ½d. per lb. on 1,500,000 tons works out at something between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000; so that it would appear, unless the whole of the statistical reasoning drawn from the best available sources be fallacious, and utterly fallacious —as indeed I hoped to hear it was—the result of this Convention will be that we shall be taxed £7,000,000 sterling annually and shall relieve the foreigner of a burden of an equivalent amount. That is a sum which would practically pay the interest on the whole cost of the late war. There are many sacrifices which we could make; but if we are asked to make a sacrifice of this size and character we ought to have a certainty of great compensating advantages.

Now, Sir, what are we going to gain if this Convention is ratified? I will leave out of my argument the rather foolish phrases which I have read and heard which tell us that by this Convention we shall advance the principles of Free Trade amongst the unenlightened foreign nations, and that a Free Trade Government must vote against bounties. I do not imagine that the people of this country are willing to pay £7,000,000 a year in order to inculcate on our foreign rivals commercial principles on which we are not all at all firmly convinced ourselves. That would be an Education Bill of even a more difficult and expensive character than the one on which we have been so long engaged in failing to understand. Some other reason for this Convention must, therefore, be sought for; and it is to be found, we are told, in the salvation of our West Indian possessions; and, in a lesser degree, in the encouragement of the English sugar refining trade. It was on these points that the President of the Board of Trade mainly based his case. I propose to leave the question of the refiners and the machinery used in the trade out of the argument. That point has been already eloquently and ably represented to the House by hon. Members who are experts on the subject. As far as I know the sugar refining trade has been, to a large extent, a foreign trade; it was always a small trade, and now it is a dwindling trade. It employs a very small number of English workmen as compared with sugar; and, except in a few very exceptional instances, it was beaten out of England by Germany long before the modern bounties came into full operation. I am only venturing to represent my own opinion; and I think the House will not be short of hon. Members to support the sugar refining trade.

It remains now to consider the question of saving the West Indies. I quite agree that we are bound to the West Indies, and that the West Indies are bound to us by every tie of old relationship, of sentiment and of a singularly glorious tradition. No more splendid part in the history of England has been enacted on so large and glorious a field as in the West Indies; and I feel sure that every Englishman is eager to sympathise with and to support the generous efforts which the Colonial Secretary has made to assist the prosperity of our West Indian possessions. But we have to remember that our West Indian possessions, on which the President of the Board of Trade so largely based his case tonight, are really only a part, a small part and a not very important part, of the British Empire. That may seem brutal, but we are discussing a commercial question, and commerce is nothing if not brutal. I would point out in this particular relation that the West Indies furnish us with only 2½ per cent. of our supply of sugar, while four-fifths of their sugar trade is concerned with the United

States, under particularly favourable relations, which they will probably forfeit if the Convention is ratified. I suppose that even the most devoted West Indian of them all will allow that there must, of necessity, be some limit of sacrifice beyond which this country cannot go. Those who have read the Report of the Commission will know the enormous difficulties of the problem. And what is the general conclusion of the Commission as regards the objects of this Convention. I cannot help thinking, with regretful respect, that some of the conclusions of the Commission have not been fully represented by those who have spoken for the Government tonight. The Commissioners are only doubtful whether the abolition of bounties would not (in their own words)

> "involve evils out of all proportion to those which it is desired to remove."

They not only refuse, with the exception of Sir Henry Norman, to recommend countervailing duties, but they point out that even if these far-reaching steps were taken, and the price of sugar rose to the highest point to which such political action might bring it, even such a rise would not place the West Indian sugar industry in a satisfactory condition. It is doubtful, they say, if the improvement would be permanent. Even, to quote the Report:—

> "If the policy of imposing countervailing duties were now adopted in the United Kingdom the West Indies would find themselves, after a time, in a position no better than that which they at present occupy."

And a little further on, considering the sugar policy of the United States and of other countries, the Commissioners add—and these are important words—

> "It is not clear that even if the bounties were abolished, another crisis of a similar character might not arise in the West Indies at a future day."

That is to say, that even if we take up the hazardous and expensive line of action which this Convention involves, the advantages to the West Indies would be, in the opinion of those who have a right to speak on the subject, more than problematical. I think that ought to carry great weight with the House. What the Committee did recommend in its somewhat discursive Report on the various Islands was, regular grants in aid on the most generous scale, the introduction of new industries and new methods of agriculture, better lines of communication, and temporary assistance, which would not alter our whole financial policy or endanger us with foreign countries, but which would probably, in the long run, land the West Indies in a more prosperous and secure position. Mr. Sydney Oliver, the Colonial Secretary and Acting Governor of Jamaica, who was Secretary to the Commission and has a very competent knowledge of the whole subject, was quoted to-night, perhaps in a wrong sense, as a witness to the extraordinary prosperity of Jamaica. I do not think the speech referred to does that; but what it does do is to give an account of various new methods and branches of agriculture. The figures are so interesting that I think they are worth quoting. Coconuts have increased 47 per cent., oranges 54 per cent, pimento 38 per cent., bananas 36 per cent., and coffee to the enormous amount of 88 per cent., whereas the increase of sugar amounts only to 0·5 per cent., or 1s. on every £100. Surely if this Convention is going to make the price of sugar so high as to make the fortunes of the West Indies, the point of these statistics would seem to show that the salvation and security of the West Indies lies, not in any great change in our financial policy, but in a judicious and continued assistance to the agricultural development of the West Indies.

I think, then, Sir, that the passing of this Convention will not save the West Indies; and nothing has been said to-night, even in the highly elaborate arguments of the President of the Board of Trade, to show that there is any certainty that the West Indian possessions will be saved by this Convention. The right hon. Gentleman dealt with hypothetical questions; and he offered hypothetical objections to what he called vague and unsubstantial statements. If the Convention will not help to save the West Indies, it certainly will not abolish bounties. In the first place Russia, Egypt, Brazil, the United States and other sugar producing countries had not joined in the scheme; and that, in my humble opinion, vitiates the whole value of the Convention. Even the parties to the Convention are maintaining their Cartel systems. In the second place, when these countries pretend to abolish direct and indirect bounties, is it to be really believed that a country like Germany, in the middle of very great commercial expansion, which is checked for the present, will abolish her preferential railway rates and her subsidised line of steamers, which are clearly an indirect bounty on produce during the period of transit. It seems to me that it is idle to suppose that Germany would do that. There is one further point with reference to the extent by which this Convention will tie our hands in the future. We read that the Government of Great Britain declares that—

> "No bounty, direct or indirect, shall be granted to sugar through the Crown Colonies during the duration of the Convention, and that no preference shall be granted in the United Kingdom to Colonial sugars as against sugars from any of the contracting States."

And we are asked to pass this novel, this entangling, this humiliating abnegation, in the same year in which the Colonial Secretary and the Colonial Premiers, in a blaze of Imperial glory, formally published their pious aspirations towards preferential treatment within the Empire. We are also to submit the Convention to the self-governing Colonies. Queensland is a large sugar producing country, and likely to be larger; and has a protecting tariff of her own in the nature of a bounty. The Government will have no power over Queensland except moral influence. Supposing Queensland repudiates the Convention, what are you going to do? You cannot coerce her; and is the British Government to be obliged to enact countervailing duties against Queensland sugar in favour of French, German or Australian sugar, and this, too, with a view to the closer union of the Empire.

It is with very great regret that I cannot support this Convention. It seems to me, at its best, rather futile and hazardous, and at its worst directly dangerous. We are likely by its provisions to lose a great deal of money, a great deal of commerce, and a great deal of employment at home, and to run the risk of very grave, very serious, and very needless complications abroad. I do most sincerely hope and pray, if it be possible, that the Government will be induced to leave this question an open one for their supporters. I do not think that any Government has ever received more loyal and devoted support than the present Government has from its supporters. We have backed the Government through thick and thin, through good report and through evil report, and stranger still, we are going to back them through the Report of the Education Bill. This step, if I may venture humbly to represent my view to my leaders, is one of more than national importance. It is a great commitment for the future, the result of which even those who are responsible for it cannot foresee. There is a definite alternative in the first scheme of the Colonial Secretary. It still remains open. It would, I think, be a great mistake if this question were hustled through in an ill-considered and hasty manner, as it will be should we be forced to a Party division tonight.

(10.10.) MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): It appears to me that one thing is pretty certain, and that is that when we have listened to an appeal from a regular supporter of His Majesty's Government, such as we have just heard, that appeal shows where the truth of the argument lies. When the supporter of the Government implores the Government to leave the matter an open question, then indeed that is the best of all testimony that if the matter were left open the Government would fail to secure a majority. What is now proposed is very dangerous. It is impossible to estimate the entanglements which will arise from this measure; and I submit that the observations made by the hon. Member who has just spoken are well founded, and that it is indeed surprising that the one form of Protection which has been attacked by the Government is that form of Protection under which large bodies of the consuming public of this country reap a steady and constant benefit. But I desire tonight not to enter on the general question; but to submit the views which occur to me with regard, particularly, to the state of our West Indian possessions. I entirely agree with the observations which have been made that it is the duty of the Government to watch over the development of our Colonies, and to safeguard their interests, subject, of course, to the condition that, in doing so, we shall not, on the one hand, depart from sound principles of finance, or, on the other hand, involve ourselves in international entanglements.

I would ask the House to consider, for a moment, what the position of the West Indies is in reference to this matter of sugar. It produces annually about 250,000 tons of sugar, of which this country consumes between 40,000 and 50,000 tons. The rest of the output goes to the United States, which is far and away the best customer of the West Indies for sugar. Therefore, in wishing to benefit the West Indies with reference to its sugar produce, we ought to ascertain how the West Indies would stand with regard to their best customer. It is not generally known that it has been reported by the West India Royal Commission (paragraph 74) that in addition to a "high protective duty," "local bounties" are granted in the United States for the production of sugar. The result of this proposal will thus apparently be that we shall have under the extraordinary stipulations of this Convention instantly to impose a countervailing duty as against the United States. Observe what the result of that would be with regard to the West Indies. The result would be that they would be at once confronted with a countervailing duty directed against a British colonial product. The West Indies are in this very peculiar position. At present, owing to the proximity of the United States, they have been able to surmount the two difficulties in the way of their achieving an entrance into the United States market. They have surmounted not only a bounty on the production of sugar in the United States, but also the protective duty there. What is now proposed is, in addition to these barriers at present imposed against the entry of West Indian sugar into the United States, to put over and above them a third barrier higher than all, namely, a countervailing duty which the West Indies would have to overcome before their sugar entered the United States market. At present, in my view, West Indian sugar has an easier entry to the States than the German, French, or Austrian, against all of which latter there is—on account of its being bounty fed — a countervailing duty. That privilege of an easier entry to its best market is now to cease! The result would be most disastrous to the West Indies. Surely, the time has arrived when it is the duty of this country to conserve and protect the market between the West Indies and the United States. The United States has recently acquired the huge possession of Cuba; and the opposition of Cuba will indeed be serious enough without confronting the West Indies with this new barrier. In order to present a case for benefiting the West Indies we are putting on them a fresh, a real, and a heavy burden with regard to their best customer, which will practically prevent the entry of West Indian sugar into the United States. It is said that after all that will be largely met by the increased price of West Indian sugar in our own markets. I want to know what is the opinion of the Government in regard to that. No one could have heard with more pleasure than I did the speech of the Under Secretary for the Board of Trade, but I failed to gather from that speech whether he argued that the price of West Indian sugar would be raised. I gathered from some of his arguments that he hardly thought it would; but if it be not raised, and raised very emphatically, I think the West Indies will give us very little thanks for the result of our diplomacy. But if the price is raised, observe what the position will be in this country. West Indian sugar will be confronted by German, Austrian, and French products in our home markets, and under what conditions will West Indian sugar be able to compete? We will not have abolished bounties in the continental nations, because they will continue under the cover and name of a surtax, the effect of which will be that all Continental nations will be permitted to place a duty of 2s. 6d. a cwt. on their products. These nations export two-thirds of their products, and consequently there will be an advantage to all the Continental nations in the shape of a surtax to the extent of 10d. per cwt. upon their entire output. What will be the result? It is said that we will have an open market and an increased price for West Indian sugar;

but West Indian sugar has to be borne from the West Indies, a distance of between 3,000 and 4,000 miles, and will have to compete with products coming from Ostend, Rotterdam, and Hamburg. For every hundred miles the continental product is borne, the colonial product must be borne a thousand miles. Is not that sufficient to show that West Indian sugar cannot compete on equal terms? By the increased cost to the producer and transmitter in the West Indies, the market is loaded in favour of the Continental commodity by the effect of distance, and still further loaded by the 10d. surtax. The thing is absolutely ridiculous, as a penny would sway the market in favour of sugar from any quarter; but when the difference is 10d. in favour of Continental producers, that shows the futility of a diplomacy which, in the name of abolishing bounties, preserved them under the name of surtax. The West Indian market will be disturbed and distorted from the States to Britain, and the result here will be as bad, if not worse, to the West Indies than it is at the present moment.

There is the other and larger element. In order to do this we have unquestionably to raise the price of sugar, not to the West Indies, but to the people of this country. Are we justified in imposing a tax of £8,000,000 sterling on the people of this country in order to perform a fantastic trick of this kind with West Indian finance? I do not know what may be the result with regard to foreign nations. It will undoubtedly be productive of something in the nature of a tariff war. We shall, I suppose, at once have to impose countervailing duties against Russia and the United States, and then we should be in the same position with regard to the United States as was Russia recently. The long and short of the matter is that this is an attempt to ride two horses. You are attempting, on the one hand, to benefit the West Indies, and on the other to conciliate and promote the sugar refining interest. I was surprised to hear that the interest of the refiner was to be treated as the principal interest, and that of the manufacturer from refined sugar as subsidiary. There are 250,000 people employed in those industries, which have been managed with the most consummate skill, and have gradually commanded the markets of the world, and of whose manufactures we export about £2,500,000 worth per annum. The refining interest employs 5,000 men, or, with the allied trades, say 10,000. So that you have 10,000 men employed in the principal interest, forsooth, and 250,000 in the subsidiary interests. I never heard the like of it. From the point of view of the West Indies, of the sugar industry as a whole, and, above all, of the general consuming British public, I submit that this proposal stands condemned.

(10.23.) MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down, supported, in his opening remarks, the appeal which was made to the Government by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bermondsey—namely, that the Government should in this case make the decision what is called an open question, instead of, I suppose, putting on, as is usually the case, the Government tellers. Of course, in one sense every question is an open question. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Bermondsey has declared his intention of voting against the Government. This is an open question, therefore, with him, and it may be an open question in the same way with others of my hon. friends who have failed to be convinced by the arguments of those who have supported this Convention. But if the meaning of the appeal is that we should not take the ordinary course with regard to a Government measure, then I must point out to my hon. friend and to the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, who has supported him, that that would involve the Government in a charge of international breach of faith and dishonour. We have to the best of our ability represented this country in the Conference at Brussels. We have come to what is practically an unanimous decision with the Powers, and we, and all the other Powers, are equally bound to do everything to show that we are sincere in accepting the provisions to which we agreed; and that we are ready to do our best to promote their adoption. To say to the House of Commons on this occasion that we will adopt the extremely rare course which is occasionally adopted by Governments where a matter is not of pressing or practical importance, or where perhaps the members of the Government themselves are divided on the subject—to say that we will adopt that course with regard to a Convention to which we unanimously agreed, would be to take a course which certainly would throw discredit upon English diplomacy.

I listened attentively to the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down, and I must confess that, although I have devoted a great deal of time to the subject, many years ago as President of the Board of Trade, and now for a considerable number of years as Secretary of State for the Colonies, I was really unable to follow him or to understand exactly at what he was driving. If I do injustice to his argument it may be want of intelligence on my part, but, at all events, it is not want of good intention. If I understand him, he argued that, in spite of this Convention, bounties would still continue in consequence of something which he called a surtax, the effect of which I do not think he exactly appreciates. But I put this to him as an alternative. In our opinion the surtax has been fixed at a rate which is not compatible with the giving of any bounty or advantage which need be taken into practical or appreciable consideration. But if I am wrong in that—if it be the fact that we are all wrong, that those who attended the Conference on our behalf and on behalf of foreign nations, and those experts who advised them, were all wrong, and that the hon. and learned Gentleman alone knows the real facts connected with this complicated sugar question, then, I say, why on earth need he trouble himself about the Convention, why predict all these evil results when, according to his own argument, it will have no effect at all?

Then the hon. and learned Gentleman went into another matter which has been raised by other hon. Members, which I will deal with very briefly indeed. He expressed a fear of what will happen if, under the terms of the Convention we are forced to take steps to penalise Russian sugar, and he assumed all kinds of terrible results that might accrue to the trade of this country. Now, I am one of those who believe that we must carry out our own fiscal system in our own way. I shall show hereafter that we are carrying it out in our own way, and, so long as we continue to be responsible for the affairs of the country, that will be our policy. We are going to carry out our own fiscal arrangements in our own way, without the slightest reference to what foreign countries may think about it, and we are not going to be terrified by those threats which are put forward with some indiscretion, as I think, by the Party opposite, as to what things will be done to us if we do what we think to be best for British interests by foreign countries who are more or less directly interested. The fact is, that with regard to Russia, Russian exports to this country are a mere fraction of her produce and a mere fraction of our supply. If we were to pass an ordinance tomorrow prohibiting the introduction of Russian sugar, it would make not the slightest difference either to Russian industries or to British industries. The matter is really not one of the slightest practical importance; but even if it were, if in the interests of this country we thought it right and proper to exclude a large supply of sugar from this country, I should regard it entirely from the point of view of British industries, and I should not regard it from the point of view of the interests of Russia or of any other country.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, in replying to the very careful and lucid and complete statement of the Government case which was made by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, insinuated that, in his opinion, that speech had been neither concise nor lively.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said it was.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that there are insinuations by affirmation as well as by negation, and I think I do not misrepresent him when I say that he suggested that my right hon. friend's statement was neither concise nor lively. I will not call the right hon. Gentleman's speech "portentous," as he objects to the phrase, but I am sure he will not be offended if I say that that speech also was neither concise nor lively. I make these prefatory observations only in order to excuse myself to the House. This is a very complicated subject and a very difficult subject. It deals with very important theories. Political economy has always been a dry science, and it therefore deals with theories which are necessarily dry, and it deals with a vast mass of facts, every one of which is disputed. In these circumstances I have no hope whatever that I shall excel either my right hon. friend or the right hon. Gentleman, or that I shall be able to make, on this occasion at any rate, a concise or lively speech. I would have gone further, and said that it was not in the power of any human being to do so if it were not for one of the most admirable speeches, short though it was, to which I have ever listened in the House of Commons—I mean the brilliant effort of my hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. I have said it is a very complicated question, and surely it is not made less so by the fact that the arguments against the Convention are mutually contradictory—that is to say, they are more or less inconsistent. The opposition is there—that is consistent enough—but the reasons given for the opposition are discordant, and in replying on the debate I have to go over a great deal of ground, and deal separately with all these various and conflicting statements.

I think I may at the outset say that the issues the House has to decide are really very simple, and are only two in number. I would call them the material and the moral issues. The material issue is the pocket question, the question of whether or not bounties are to the pecuniary advantage of this country, or to the advantage of the industries of this country. That is the first question. The second question, which I call the moral question, goes, in my opinion, very deep down into the foundation of our Empire. It is this—Are we prepared to say that the pecuniary question, and that alone, is to decide our policy? Are we to say that we are ready to repudiate the principles of common justice if it be found that the adoption of those principles may involve us in more or less pecuniary loss? Now, as to the pecuniary question, there is one thing which seems to me to have been lost sight of on the other side of the House. I regard their calculations—I do not say it in any offensive sense—as absurd, because they are so purely hypothetical, I regard their predictions as absurd, because the same predictions have been made, to my knowledge, for the last twenty-five years and have always proved false; and they are at liberty if I make any predictions to regard mine with equal disfavour. The fact is, this is a case on which nobody can dogmatise as to the future. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers, and counter cheers.] I am glad to be cheered from both sides of the House. I can only say that had that statement been so generally approved of and so generally accepted at the beginning of the debate it would have saved at least three-fourths of the speeches to which we have listened.

My first point is this, that in any estimate of pecuniary advantage you must not consider only a possible temporary advantage, but you must consider also the permanent result; and that leads me to say that in matters of economics, if you can agree upon a principle, you must accept that principle, and act upon it in spite of questions of temporary expediency. That is what distinguishes the old Free Traders, the authors of Free Trade, from those who now parade in their cast-off garments. The hon. Gentleman the Member for South Shields told us, in what to me was a really amazing speech, that this Convention was an attempt on the part of a Tory Government to secure Protection for certain industries. I say that is a perfectly amazing statement. What is the principle which lies at the bottom of Free Trade, and is in itself, therefore, contradistinct from Protection? We have been told by my right hon. friend that this is a quarrel of words, and that everything depends on the definition of Free Trade. But who is entitled to give the definition of Free Trade? Surely the author of Free Trade. I was going to refer to Mr. Cobden, but probably the real author of Free Trade was Adam Smith. At any rate, Mr. Cobden was so completely the apostle of Free Trade that I think he may be taken as an authoritative exponent of its doctrine. What was the doctrine of Free Trade? It was not founded merely on commercial expediency or on questions of temporary loss or gain, but on the endeavour to establish as a principle that everything should be done to secure the natural course of production and exchange. Mr. Cobden said something to this effect —I do not know that I am using his exact words—that "What we (meaning the Free Traders) want is that every natural source of supply should be open to us as nature and nature's God intended it should be, and without artificial hindrance." He said, "Until we gain that we shall never be satisfied." But this Convention, on the face of it, at any rate, is surely intended to secure this equality, and to secure the natural course of trade. Here you have a great trade artificially diverted by a stimulus given by foreign countries to their own producers. If you can exactly keep the situation, not protecting your own trade, not giving the slightest advantage to your own trade, but putting it in what may fairly be called the natural situation, surely in that case you are following the strictest line of the principle which I have said is the principle declared by Mr. Cobden to be that of Free Trade. Our object is to secure the natural course of production and exchange. Bounties interfere with that natural course. They contravene the principle. They destroy the ordinary arrangements which would result from natural conditions. They divert capital and labour from the employment in which naturally they would find the most remunerative field, and they turn them into other directions less to the advantage of the country concerned. And, accordingly, you will find that until the last few years, when a new school of economists has started into existence—talk of the new economy! The new economy is not found on this side of the House; it is found on that [Pointing to the Opposition]—and until the last few years, I say, until the new economy represented by such an expert as the hon. Member for West Islington and others, no economist of the slightest eminence, no Commission ever appointed by any Government, no Committee of Parliament, no authority of the slightest importance, has ever denied what seems to me to be the plain fact that bounties absolutely contradict the principle of Free Trade, and are in themselves injurious to the country that gives them, and injurious in the long run to the country that at the moment profits by them. ("Oh.") Oh yes! You cannot take half of the proposition without taking the whole of it. I assert, and I am sure that I cannot be contradicted, that you will not find a single passage from any economist of note that does not accept that proposition—that they are injurious, as I have said, not only to the giver, but in the long run to the recipient.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT made a remark across the table which did not reach the gallery.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Really, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire always tries to interrupt what, after all, is a serious argument, by personal allusions. I think he ought by this time to know that it is rather embarrassing and tends to protract the discussion. Still, out of courtesy to him, I will reply to his interruption.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I only meant to say it was not a new doctrine.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What is not a new doctrine? I have been laying down a doctrine as being the accepted doctrine of every authority on Free Trade, and the right hon. Gentleman says it is not a new doctrine!

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said it was not a new doctrine to condemn countervailing duties against bounties.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman is inconsequent. I was not speaking of countervailing duties. I am going to speak of them. At the present moment I am speaking of bounties. I did not say whether countervailing duties were better than bounties or worse than bounties. I must proceed by steps, and what I was saying was that they are condemned as mutually injurious by every great authority down to the last two or three years. One may say, Sir, that not only are bounties contrary to Free Trade, but that if they are instituted, as one of the speakers said, as a form of protection, they are a particularly objectionable form of protection. And, at any rate, Protection, whether right or wrong, is a defensive policy. Protection is intended to secure to the country establishing that policy the whole of its own trade for its own producers. Bounties are intended to do a great deal more. Bounties are an aggressive policy. They are intended to invade and to secure the markets of another country to which entrance cannot be obtained by legitimate means. They are intended to secure them by artificial stimulus and arrangement.

Then it is said—by the new school, not by the old—that these bounties only injure the bounty-giving people; and really I have been perfectly astounded by the observations of some hon. Gentlemen opposite with regard to foreign nations. If a foreigner had been present he certainly would not have been flattered by what he would have heard, because in effect what they say is that they recognise that foreign nations are not philanthropic, and that therefore, if they spend this vast sum of money it is not from any altruistic purpose, or special goodwill towards this country, which is the chief beneficiary; but they say the statesmen and economists of foreign countries are such utter fools that they have gone on paying I do not know how many millions a year—amounting at present to something like seven or eight millions—for the benefit of people with whom they are in the most earnest and strenuous competition, without being in the slightest degree aware of what they are doing. That is a most extraordinary view to take. My own opinion is different. I admit I attach a great deal more importance to the astuteness of foreign statesmen; I do not think the whole of the wisdom rests on this side of the Channel. I do say, let us consider before we condemn those "poor, ignorant foreigners" whether they may not have had a serious object and may not have been very near accomplishing it.

What has been the object of foreign Powers? It has been, in the first place, to develop their own agriculture and manufactures. The hon. Member for South Shields, I think, triumphantly appealed to what he says is the fact that since the adoption of a Protectionist policy by foreign countries their trade has fallen off proportionately to ours. We now are the one nation which maintains commercial supremacy on the Continent of Europe. Well, Sir, as a convinced Free-Trader, I listened to that argument really with some alarm. Because, if Free Trade is to stand upon such a foundation as that—upon the assumption that Protection has reduced proportionately the trade of foreign countries in comparison with our own—we have indeed to look forward to a bad time for Free Trade, because the absolute reverse is the case. As a matter of fact, since the establishment and since the increase of this Protectionist policy, we have found the trade in the United States, which is most Protectionist of all nations, and the trade of Germany, which comes very near at its heels—we have found that trade increasing with giant strides, and we have found it increasing in very much larger proportion than our own. I have always thought that there was an answer to that from a free-trade point of view. We must attribute this enormous extension of trade to other circumstances without detracting from the principle of Free Trade. When the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite raised the point which he made in this connection, and put forward the failure of foreign nations and our success as the real basis of his faith in Free Trade, then, I think, he was indeed resting upon a most slender foundation.

MR. ROBSON: I do not wish to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but what I said was that we had maintained among the nations of Europe our supremacy in the spread of international trade.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I was saying that foreigners must not be considered so ignorant as some hon. Members suppose. What I wish to point out is that these countries have a definite object in view, whether it is right or wise, or not. Their first object was to improve their own agriculture and to extend their own manufactures. They have done so to a most remarkable degree. There is nothing more remarkable in the course of the last few years than the growth of a perfectly gigantic industry, first in beet-growing, and secondly in the refinement of sugar. While our industries have remained stationary, or have gone back, the whole of this vast trade has been secured by our foreign competitors, and secured entirely because of the bounties ["No."]. It is fair to suppose that they have always had in view the possibility that by their competition they might exclude those who otherwise would have been their legitimate competitors, and that they might destroy legitimate industries which otherwise would have been successfully prosecuted. Now, then, I come to a point which I wish to press upon the House. If this object has been accomplished — and it has been nearly accomplished—what will happen? Prices will go up and every advantage which you can show to the working of the jam manufacturers, and all the rest of those who are contesting the Convention, will be more than stultified by the increased price in sugar which you will have to pay. At the present time we hear a great deal about trusts. What is the objection to trusts? No one objects to the legitimate combination of manufacturers to reduce the cost of production, or if possible to prevent unnecessary and illegitimate competition. The objection to trusts in America and in this country is always this, that it is feared—and experience shows that it is rightly feared—that they use their power in order to crush out all other competition, and that when they have done that they make the public pay for the whole transaction. This Convention, in my opinion, comes at the right time, although I am not going to say that in my opinion it should not have come earlier. At all events, there is an argument to be made in favour of allowing the bounties to continue until they had just succeeded, and then to stop them. That, at all events, is what we have done.

Now, what has been the result of bounties up to the present in the competition between different countries? In the competition between the countries, France has substantially been defeated, and now you have arrived at this situation, that a practical monopoly has been secured by Austria and Germany; and if bounties are allowed, were allowed to go on, I do not doubt for a moment that the prices would have been materially raised as a result of the monopoly that would have been established. There can be no doubt as to what would happen if we were to submit to a great monopoly in this article. Our interest is as Mr. Cobden described it; our interest is to multiply the sources of supply, to trust to natural competition, under natural circumstances, to keep the price of any article down to its legitimate level. If we were to allow the cane sugar industry of our Colonies to be killed by this unfair competition, if we were to allow the superior article, this cane sugar, to be killed by the inferior article by the artificial stimuli, I believe our descendants would rue the policy that we should have pursued. These are the general principles on which I suggest that bounties ought to be condemned, and I say I cannot understand how any person can deny that these, at any rate, are views which are in accordance with the strictest doctrine of Free Trade as it was declared by Cobden, by Bright, and by the economists who preceded them.

Now I want to consider other objections that arise from the particular situation in which our own interests are placed—I mean the interests of the refining industry and the interests of the West Indies. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth referred —and I do not in the least complain—to language used by me in 1881. Well, Sir, I do say in regard to all these quotations that I hope that those who make them take the trouble to read the whole of the documents and the speeches which they quote (I do not expect them to give the whole of the documents to the House) and see and consider what is the spirit of those speeches as well as any particular passages. But I pass that on the present occasion—I pass it because I am perfectly aware, and I am here to declare that since 1881 circumstances have entirely changed. No one knows that better than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire and his friends—that circumstances have changed, and when circumstances change, opinions change at the same time. But there is one point which those who quote me so freely seem to have lost sight of. These speeches were not in favour of bounties. The importance of that lies in the application of it. In 1881, as much as now, the Government of which I was a member was opposed to bounties. We thought them disastrous things, and that they ought by all reasonable means to be put an end to. I remember the deputation to which my right hon. friend referred. It was a deputation of sugar refiners and others interested to Mr. Gladstone, and I was present. But the right hon. Gentleman does me too much honour when he suggests that on that occasion anything I said was in a special sense to be taken as representing the Government, even as against the utterance of the Prime Minister. I was the youngest member of that Government, but I had never been a member of a Government before, and I did not at that time arrogate to myself any such position, and I accepted Mr. Gladstone as the true and only representative of the policy of the Government. On the occasion of that deputation, Mr. Gladstone was extremely sympathetic. He did not in any way exclude the idea of countervailing duties; but he said that at that time the case was not proved. There were three facts then which weighed with Mr. Gladstone and with his Government. The first was that what was then asked was that we should impose countervailing duties on sugar, and wait to see what the foreign Governments would do. That is to say, we should at once impose a countervailing duty against all the countries of Europe. Now the situation is entirely changed. At present all the principal sugar growing countries have agreed to this Convention, by which bounties are to be abolished; and the penal Clause can only come into operation against those countries which are outside the Convention, and which can be treated as non-exporting countries. The second thing was, at that time we had no evidence whatever that any serious injury had been done either to the sugar refining industry or to the production of sugar in the West Indies, and in those days we were young and credulous, and we were under the belief that foreign Powers were anxious to get rid of their bounties; that the process, in words which have been repeated to-night, and which I remember so well, had already begun, and we had only to be quiet and leave matters as they were in order that bounties might be abolished by voluntary action. Have they been abolished by the voluntary action of the countries concerned? And that is twenty-one years ago. Not a bit of it. They have gone on with greater vigour than ever; they have increased again and again, and they have produced greater and greater results, as those countries think, for their own benefit, or, as we may think, with some inconvenience to their exchequer, which is a different thing from a mere question of national advantage. But to this day it is perfectly certain that there is no chance whatever of bounties being abolished by any voluntary arrangement among the Powers, unless we, who hold the largest market, will agree to give our sanction to any agreement they make for the insertion of a penal clause in case in future they should break the agreement. That is the great change which has taken place since then. When you consider what was said in that day in the very able memorandum signed by Mr. Farrer, as he was then, Permanent Secretary to the Board of Trade, you will see a series of predictions and statements based upon arguments which at the time appeared to be sound, but which experience has absolutely falsified.

The refining trade since then has gone from bad to worse. I was surprised to hear the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire refer once more to the fact that one great firm of sugar refiners was in the happy position of making a great fortune. It is perfectly true. There is still, as the remnant of a great industry—and no one can tell how much greater it might have been by now—the production of "Tate's crystals," and a few other considerable firms. But the refining trade has lost in the last twenty-one years a great amount of capital, and a large number of persons have been diverted to other employments with great suffering to themselves, and the industry has become practically insignificant. My right hon. friend referred to a very interesting Convention which was made in 1864 for the protection of this refining industry, and was made by Mr. Gladstone. It was in the early sixties. Mr. Gladstone, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared that the object of this was to preserve and develop that great and important industry of sugar refining in this country. Nothing came of that. It was the intention to impose countervailing duties. Countervailing duties were not imposed. Now I would note, when we are dealing with hypotheses, is it not permissible for me to deal with the hypothesis that if in 1864 or

1863 that Convention had been made operative, and the sugar-refining of this country had been—not protected, I do not mean that—but preserved from the unfair, artificial competition to which it was subjected—why is it impossible to conceive, in those circumstances, that the industry, considerable as it is now, might have been fifty-fold greater, because, in that time, the industries on the Continent have increased fifty or even a hundred fold? Why should not we have obtained from our own citizens and working men all the advantages which have been gained for foreigners?

Then I am told that in this or that industry a large number of people are maintained by the destruction of the sugar-refining industry. When we began the evening, and had nothing but pamphlets to go upon, we were told that there were 100,000 people employed in those industries. The right hon. Member for West Monmouth raised them to 200,000. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for South Shields raised them to 250,000, and the last speaker, going beyond them all, translated 250,000 persons into 250,000 men, which would mean, with their families, more than one million—a splendid instance of the value of hypotheses. I do not believe for a moment that there are more than 50,000 people employed in different trades which, in any sensible degree, are dependent on sugar; but whether they be 50,000 or 1,000,000, I say there is nothing whatever to induce us to believe that we might not have employed even more British subjects—more British capital, more British machinery — in sugar - refining and production, if only we had protected them against this competition in time.

Then I come to the West Indies. I am not going to dwell at length upon that. But surely some of the—well, I will say —taunts or observations which have been made are unnecessary. I am Secretary of State for the Colonies. If I am anything, I am the representative in this House of the interests of those Colonies, and if I speak with some feeling in regard to them—well, I hope I may be excused, and I should be ashamed of myself if I did not sympathise with their sufferings and complaints, when I think those sufferings are real, and when I know that those complaints are just. What has been the history of the West Indies since this bounty business began? Our history is not a very honourable one with regard to these, which we once called our most flourishing, and which still, as my hon. friend the Member for Southwark says, are amongst our most glorious possessions in consequence of the traditions with which they were connected. The history of our relations with them is not a very honourable one to this country. From the time when we practised a vicarious virtue and emancipated the slaves and gave what was an altogether inadequate compensation for the property we destroyed—from that time to this I am afraid that we have too often considered our interests without considering at the same time the legitimate interests of our colonists and fellow-subjects. But I say their history has been the history of a struggle for existence for the last twenty years. The right hon. Member for West Monmouth spoke about Jamaica. I will take Jamaica as a good illustration. Jamaica is not prospering. Jamaica has been altogether behindhand, has been piling up deficits, has been in a most difficult position, and has caused me the greatest anxiety. By the strictest economy, by an economy in the provision for the administration of justice, in the provision for medical supply, and education, by economy which has been called for by the necessities of the case, but which otherwise I should certainly not have thought true economy, I have reduced the expenditure, and by efforts on which I will not dwell, partly by increased taxation upon people already impoverished, by that and other means, at last I have been able to re-establish an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. But under what circumstances? The sugar industry continues in Jamaica and the West Indies. Why? Three or four years ago the Royal Commission were of opinion, as they well might be from the circumstances that came before them, that the sugar industry was doomed almost in the course of the next few years. The United States, kinder to our Colonies than we ourselves have been, established a system of countervailing duties, which for a time gave temporary relief to the West Indies. That relief cannot be permanent, whether the Convention is carried or not. The countervailing duties at the present time countervail only bounties and not Cartels, and therefore there is still a bounty against West Indian sugar in the United States; and, moreover, the United States is making such progress with its protected industries—with its folly, as hon. Gentlemen opposite would say, with its foolish lack of the most ordinary economic principles—that in the next few years it will certainly be self-supplying in this matter by means of its dependencies, with the help of Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Under those circumstances we should be then in the position in which the Royal Commission found themselves. In the course of another year or two sugar would go, and if sugar goes Jamaica will go as well, and it is one of those islands called comparatively prosperous. As to Barbados, St. Vincent, and the smaller islands of the Windward group, nothing could save them; they would be reduced to a condition in which they could only be kept alive by bounties on a very large scale indeed, and even then the black population, to whom we owe great obligations, would be little removed from pauperism.

I wish I could appeal to the working man direct. [Laughter.] Hon. Members opposite laugh, but have I ever refrained from telling the working man what I believed to be true. Political opposition may go a long way, but nobody, I think, will accuse me of any lack of courage in expressing my opinions to the working men, as well as to every class in the community. I wish I could address an audience of working men, I should appeal to their sense of justice—but that is another question. I would appeal also to their pockets and their interest. I would say, "What have you done? You have destroyed a trade which might have found employment for goodness knows how many people, and you may go on and throw away trade after trade, the best trades of the country, for it is not the worst trades which are competitors for this bounty system, it is trades which would naturally provide us with large profits—and you allow these trades, one after another, to be thrown away or handed over to our competitors." And a trade once gone—men of business will agree with me—it is not very easy to restore it. In the West Indies, although the land is in a very impoverished condition, they buy £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 worth of British goods from this country—they might be able to buy ten or twenty times that amount, but even two or three million's worth of British manufactures is not altogether a thing to be despised. I will undertake to say that that alone will keep something like 40,000 persons fully employed, and that is worth considering when we are asked to consider the number employed in each separate trade.

One word I must say. What is the alternative which is suggested to us? It is suggested by some persons that we should not agree to this Convention, but that we should give grants to the West Indies. Now, whenever I have come down to this House to ask for these grants they have been described in sneering terms as doles and eleemosynary gifts by the hon. Gentlemen who are opposed to this Convention. Now they put forward these doles against the Convention, but if the Convention were destroyed I should not find them voting for these "doles." They are not doles, they are the incomplete payment of our debts, and do not believe for a moment that anything that has been referred to as possible would be a sufficient dole in the event of the ruin of the West Indies. We are told that the West Indies are of no consequence to us, and that they send us only 46,000 tons of the 240,000 tons they export. Well, I would say that the great majority of their production goes to the United States because of exceptional and temporary circumstances. When those circumstances come to an end, the only market for the West Indies, for their 240,000 tons, is this country. It would be two million tons if only they had a fair chance, and if, when they had a fair chance, they knew how to take advantage of it [OPPOSITION laughter]—that is certainly so—if they knew how to take advantage of it, and we were able to introduce fresh capital and enterprise. Therefore, looking at it purely from the point of view of loss and gain, do not think that by getting rid of this Convention you are going to get rid of the expenditure which will be thrown on the working men as well as on other classes of the community. The expenditure will be gigantic, unless you are to take the advice once offered by the hon. member for Northampton and let these colonies go, or sell them, for what they would fetch, to any other Power.

I come now to a very important point, and that is the argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite that the price which we are to pay is too high. The right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire told you, and other hon. Members also, who, I think, if they had really studied the question would have refrained from such an argument, that the cost to the country will be the amount of the bounty, which they put at the maximum of £5, multiplied by the total importation of sugar into this country. That really is perfectly ludicrous. Anybody who knows the true facts of the case knows that, whatever may be the amount of the bounty, the advantage to the consumer is very much less. A large part of the bounty goes to countervail the natural advantages of the country against which the bounty is directed, and as to the rest it is divided between the consumer on the one part and the producer on the other. He takes as much as he can, and gives to the consumer the least possible amount which is necessary in order to secure the market. I will put an imaginary case, which I think will serve to make my meaning perfectly clear. Suppose that the United States can make a particular class of iron at £4 per ton. Suppose that, owing to our inferior natural advantages, it would cost us £5 per ton to make the same thing. But suppose our Government comes in and says, "We want to get for England the home trade in this particular class of iron in the United States; we will therefore give a bounty of 30s. a ton." Hon. Gentlemen opposite would say, "Oh! that is a boon of 30s. per ton to the people of the United States. They will have entirely as a gift from this country 30s. per ton for every single ton they use." That is perfectly absurd. In the first place, £1 of the bounty goes to equalise the natural disadvantages of this country. It goes to lower our cost from £5 to £4, and that leaves only 10s. of the bounty. How much will it take to get the trade in this article? If one shilling will do it, the producer will get nine shillings for himself and he will give one shilling to the consumer. If it takes five shillings, he will keep one half himself and give the other half to the consumer. But it is perfectly clear to anyone who knows the course of trade, to anyone who has been in business, that of the bounty on any article whatever which is given by a foreign country, it is only a small proportion that finds its way into the consumer's pocket. It is not these seven or eight millions which are talked of with so much readiness that we have to deal with. It is only the very small proportion that falls into the pockets of the consumers. But if the bounty were abolished I am not certain that there would be even that small advantage. If there were, it would be compensated for by the regularity of prices, which is a more important thing in business even than the prices themselves, and it would also be compensated for by the natural extension of trade.

I must leave the right hon. Gentleman opposite some time, and so there are many points which I must pass over. One thing I must briefly refer to. It is said that if the price of sugar is not raised the West Indies will not benefit. That has been dealt with by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade. But in any case the West Indies will benefit in the first place by getting rid of the sense of injustice which presses upon them; in the second place they will get rid of the irregularity in their trade, and, in the third place, by the restoration of their credit, without which it is absolutely impossible for them to provide the new machinery and to secure the results which they ought to secure from the scientific prosecution of their industry. I will say no more upon the financial, pecuniary, or pocket question. In my opinion the sacrifice which we shall be called upon to make is a very small and trifling one. But even if it were considerable, then, on moral grounds, I for one say that we are still bound in honour and duty to make it. Mr. Gladstone said, with reference to this very subject, that we were bound to act equitably by foreign nations, but that above all we were bound to act equitably towards our own fellow-subjects. That is a truth which we cannot safely ignore. Our Empire—well, there may have been many failings in our administration of it, many faults which we have to regret, but at all events we shall all agree that it cannot be maintained unless we accept to the full the principles of justice and of mutual sacrifice. If we allow our Colonies to assume, or to believe, that for some trifling advantage to ourselves we are ready to sacrifice their interests, then I say the knell of the British Empire will be tolled. We are endeavouring at this very moment, and not without success, to impress on them their duty and their responsibility, and we are urging them to take a larger share of the obligations of Empire. We are asking them to accept the solidarity in which one part of the Empire would be a matter of concern for every other part. And I appeal to all those who agree at any rate in this policy; to all who agree that the Empire should be based upon these principles of justice, who think that the loss of Empire would be for this country in the future to lead a meaner life, and to have more paltry ambitions; to those who would shrink from anything that would lose for us our high place and our mission in the world—to those I appeal in this case to do justice, and not to seek a doubtful victory, gained at the expense of the interest of our kinsfolk across the seas, and of the principles upon which our Empire has been founded.

(11.30.) SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman has omitted any argument which he thought the House wished to know, for certainly I should have been glad to hear further argument in support of the proposition which is now before the House. This is a very important, a very complicated, and a very difficult subject, and I must say I think it is very much to be regretted that by reason of the Rules of the House the time left to us to discuss it is so limited. We are now asked to approve of this Convention fixing a policy for the next five years which may impose on the Government the duty of levying taxation, and may subject the people of this country to considerable inconvenience. The right hon. Gentleman has evoked the Imperial interests of this country and asked the support of all who are prepared to maintain Imperial interests as he depicts them, but surely no one desires in the least degree to impair or minimise the Empire's greatness. I imagine that we are at one in our object, though we may differ in our methods. But I think the right hon. Gentleman will admit that that cause is not advanced by urging this argument in support of every proposal whatever. If this proposal of the right hon. Gentleman is a wise one, it should be defended solely on its merits, and if it is unwise, it gains nothing by eloquent and passionate appeals to the interest of the British Empire. Nor do we think that he gave the real meaning of Free Trade when he told us that this proposal was in pursuance of the doctrines of Free Trade. I should think, undoubtedly, that bounties are most mischievous, and entirely contrary to those great principles. I should not be disposed to agree with the right hon. Gentleman that every nation ought, under all circumstances, to make self-sacrifice by abandoning the advantage it enjoys from other nations which think it proper to give bounties. I will not follow the right hon. Gentleman through his former speeches on the matter, because I do not think anything is to be gained by it. But the right hon. Gentleman has not really answered the points of objection urged during the debate.

In the first place, he to told us he was resolved to maintain British interests, and to judge of this and all other proposals from the point of view of British interest. This Convention is open to many objections. One is that it does deprive him and us of the right for the next five years of judging in the British interest what taxation should be imposed in relation to the sugar trade. By the Seventh Article a Committee consisting mainly of foreigners would scrutinise our taxation and decide authoritatively upon the amount we should impose as countervailing duties, and also what countries are to have restrictions placed on their process of cultivation. I cannot see how this proposition is to be defended. It may be said that it is a sort of international arbitration. If that were so I should be most heartily in favour of it. But we do not under this Convention choose our arbitrators, nor are those who are to decide what the tariffs of this country are to be in regard to sugar disinterested parties. On the contrary they are the delegates of those who are most interested against our interests, namely, the producing countries, while we are a consuming country. In effect what we do by the Seventh Article is to submit beforehand to whatever the producing nations may command by their delegates, and the House of Commons is expected to pass whatever legislation they may prescribe. That is an entirely unreasonable and humiliating position, and I think it is quite inconsistent with what the Colonial Secretary said, that we should have at all times a free hand in dealing with this question. I say it is absurd to suppose that we should have impartiality from these delegates. They represent different interests from our own, and there is every reason to suppose that they will use the authority conferred upon them in the interests of their own commerce, and against the interests of ours. It has been stated with perfect truth that the effect in bounty-giving States will be to save the amount of the bounties which they may divert to other industries, for there is no security that they will give up their own protective duties. We shall gain no market by the

Convention. On the contrary, by virtue of the operation of the surtax, the other nations will be able to maintain their own markets intact, which is what they desire, and they reserve the right to themselves to consider increased import duties to prevent any other nation coming into competition in their own market. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as if the West Indies had been extremely ill-used by this country. Where has been the great wrong done to the West Indies by this country, for which we ought to make atonement and stand in a white sheet? I am not aware of it, although the right hon. Gentleman may be, with his fuller knowledge. Slave owning existed in the West Indies and was abolished, for which we gave very handsome compensation. Perhaps it may be said that the compensation was not adequate, but that was a long time ago. Since then where is the wrong that we have done to the West Indies, for which the people of this country are to make atonement? I most heartily sympathise with the planters in the West Indies, and I deeply regret the distress they are in. But we ought to regard this subject from the point of view of justice to all parties.

As regards the particular evils of bounties, which the right hon. Gentleman says are one of the causes which have contributed to that distress, we are not responsible for them. The right hon. Gentleman himself admits that for a long time we have done our best to get rid of them. Therefore, the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman has taken up appears to have no foundation, nor has the right hon. Gentleman cited any authority in history on the subject. We are none the less bound to do what we can, within reason, to assist a distressed colony, especially in the peculiar circumstances in which the West Indies stand. We know that only 40,000 or 50,000 tons of sugar are imported into this country from the West Indies out of the 250,000 tons which they produce. A Royal Commission went to the West Indies, but they did not say that the bounties were the cause of the misfortune. Certainly they did not recommend the imposition of countervailing duties. They recommended various fiscal reforms—reforms of tariff, land reform, and reforms with regard to loans. Surely if the right hon. Gentleman thinks that we owe the West Indies something, whether by reason of our past misconduct, or by reason of our present benevolence, he ought to have thought of the course recommended by the Royal Commission. Let me suppose for a moment that the abolition of the bounties and the ratification of the Convention would do good to the West Indies, what are we to do? The abolition of the bounties will raise the price of 1,600,000 tons of sugar in order to benefit the producers of 40,000 or 50,000 tons of sugar shipped to Great Britain. The right hon. Gentleman has not dealt with that aspect of the question in his most interesting and eloquent speech. If the price of sugar is raised in this country to the extent of a halfpenny a pound, that means a loss of £7,000,000, or £8,000,000 sterling. But let me suppose that the price is only raised a farthing a pound, that means a loss of £3,000,000 or £4,000,000. If the whole of that £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 went to the West Indies there would be something in it, but only two and a half per cent. of it would go to the West Indies, inasmuch as they only ship 2½ per cent. of the amount of sugar that comes into this country. It is a question of the first importance how far the people of the United Kingdom are to allow the price of their own food to be raised in order to benefit our colonies. I would say it would be far better to give monetary assistance in the shape of loans and gifts, even on a large scale, to enable the West Indian planters to equip themselves, than to embark on the doubtful policy of raising the price of articles of food in this country. Every one sympathises with the sugar refiners, but they are in no worse position than many other trades in this country, which are not so prosperous as we desire. They are an insignificant trade that has been reduced to insignificance partly on account of the bounties; and as this country was not responsible for the bounties there is no reason why we should be called upon to make any great sacrifices to avert their consequences. The interest is now a small one, and on the other hand there is the interest of the other trades, such as the confectionery and jam trades, which employ at least 150,000 hands. Besides these trade interests there is the entire population of consumers, to whom the consequences must be serious. It is very difficult to foretell what the price of sugar will be for the next ten years to come, but at any rate there must be some rise, and I think a very considerable rise; and that will fall on the very poorest part of the community. This is the second time that the present Government has chosen to inflict loss on the poorest classes of the community. The danger of monopoly of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke, is remote when it involves the co-operation of seven or eight nations, with the

United States always ready to compete. The President of the Board of Trade regarded this Convention apparently as a triumph of Free Trade. Now, if you could get all these contracting Powers to this Convention to abolish their system of Protection altogether, or even on the particular article of sugar, there must be something to be said for countervailing duties. But they maintain Protection even on sugar. Their protection is, as the right hon. Gentleman said, as injurious to them as to us. I was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman did not admit that these contracting Powers only proposed to abolish the only part of the protective system which was most hurtful to them and most beneficial to us. I cannot see that there is any triumph in Free Trade in that. I say that that is only another step towards a policy of Protection, and I think the speech of the right hon Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, who avowed himself to be a staunch free-trader, smacked more distinctly of fair trade than anything I have heard for some time. Every argument that the right hon. Gentleman used in favour of countervailing duties against bounties would be equally applicable to any protective duties. This policy, once embarked upon, would lead to almost incalculable consequences. I am sorry to say that I think this Convention is humiliating, in the first instance, because it subjects the legislation of this country to the dictation of foreign delegates; and it is also retrogressive, and I believe will do no good to the West Indies.

*SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.): If there were time I think I might address the House in an extremely long speech. I should begin, in the correct form, with a sheaf of congratulations to a most distinguished Member of the House. The right hon. Gentleman has afforded me and many others genuine gratification by his Parliamentary skill during many years, but never have I heard the right hon. Gentleman in better and more ingenious form than tonight, because the right hon. Gentleman undertook what was a new *rôle*, although new *rôles* were not unfamiliar to him. He undertook to deliver a Free Trade speech in the cause of Protection, and that takes a bit of doing. He rose to oppose the principles which, as he had been reminded tonight, were enunciated by Richard Cobden, and he did it so skilfully and so ingeniously that not even those sitting behind him ever imagined that he did it for his own amusement. The right hon. Gentleman delivered his speech from two different and conflicting points of view. One half suggested that the effect of this Resolution would be to increase the cheapness of sugar, and the other half went to prove that it would not cheapen sugar, but in either event the Government were wrong. [Cries of "Divide."] We shall divide in a very short time; at any rate that is my own opinion. The popularity of cheapness, as cheapness, has been greatly exaggerated. [Cries of "Divide."] Of course we all desire that the food of the people and other necessaries of life should be cheap, but I doubt very much whether other cheap articles are generally popular, and I know they are generally nasty. The whole of this opposition is based on a Protectionist agitation got up in the interests of manufacturers——

It being Midnight, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the Business:—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

(12.0) Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 223; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 573.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George

Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, Nbrth)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Lord
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Rt Hon H (Som'rs't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton

Kewsick, William
Kimber, Henry

Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col H. L. B. (Cambs.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Majendie, James A. H.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Haldane, Rt Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(12.13) Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 213; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 574.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R, F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, RtHnH (Somerset, E
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHn. W.G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool.
M'Calmont, Col. H.L.B (Cambs)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, RtHn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon C. B. Stuart-

Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Grant, Corrie
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to

Resolved, "That this House approves the policy embodied in the Convention relating to Sugar, signed at Brussels on the 5th day of March, 1902, and, in the event of that Convention receiving the ratifications required to make it binding, is prepared to adopt the necessary measures to enable His Majesty to carry out its provisions."

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 25th November, 1902.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:

1. Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2).
2. Supreme Court of Judicature.

WORKHOUSE NURSING.

Departmental Committee appointed by the Local Government Board to inquire into the nursing of the sick poor in workhouses:—

Part I. Report and summary of recommendations.

Part II. Minutes of evidence, together with appendix and index to evidence.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

Report on the Dutch Brined Vegetable Industry; Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table

House adjourned at Four o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 25th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.

MESSAGE TO ATTEND THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went; and, being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to—

(1.) Appropriation (No. 2) Act, 1902.

(2.) Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1902.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Birkenhead, and Battersea; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Ayr, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alterations: from Battersea, and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Parr, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition from Battersea, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. (No. 381.)

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (DUTCH BRINED VEGETABLE INDUSTRY).

Copy presented, of Report on the Dutch Brined Vegetable Industry [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Fever in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the prevalence of typhus and other fevers in the Island of Lewis, and the sanitary conditions of many of the townships, will he say whether arrangements can be made for the medical officer of the Local Government Board for Scotland to visit the Island at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The facts are that six cases of typhus have been reported, four of which are now convalescent. There does not, therefore, seem any necessity for a special inspection such as is suggested by the hon. Member.

Transfer of British Trawlers to Foreign Flags.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that eight trawlers owned by the Grimsby and North Sea Steam Trawling Company, and six trawlers owned by the Metropolitan Steam Fishing Company, have been transferred to the Norwegian Flag and registered at Brevig under the name of the Zodiac Steam Fishing Company, so that as foreign trawlers they can now fish in the Moray Firth, will he state the result of the action which the Norwegian Government has taken with a view to test the *bona fides* of these transfers.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The result of the action by the Norwegian Government entitled the vessels in question to registration as Norwegian vessels.

Accident at Waverley Station, Edinburgh —Shunting Operations.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to an accident which occurred on the North British Railway at Waverley Station, on the 23rd April last, whereby a shunter named Sinclair Thomson was injured; and, in view of the recommendation of the Board's sub-inspector that stringent instructions should be given against the practice of detaching screw-coupled vehicles when in motion, will he state whether the North British Railway Company have yet arranged to give effect to this recommendation.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Yes; the railway company informed the Board of Trade on the 12th September last that instructions had been given forbidding the practice of detaching screw-coupled vehicles while in motion at Waverley Station.

Cruelty to Animals—Case of James Younger of Nottingham.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a case in which James Younger, of 44, Bathley Street, Nottingham, was accused of cruelty to a hired horse on 23rd September, 1900; whether he is aware that the case resulted in each side having to pay its own costs, although the defendant was fined 40s.; whether a petition and other representations have been made to the Home Office on behalf of the accused, making allegations against the character of the evidence; and whether he will cause further inquiry into this matter to be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) This case came before my predecessor on James Younger's own application in September 1901, and inquiry was made with regard to it. It appeared that the defendant had been sentenced to imprisonment by the Court of Summary Jurisdiction and had appealed to Quarter Sessions, where the conviction was confirmed, but a fine of 40s. was substituted for the sentence of imprisonment. No grounds were found for intervention on the part of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Again, in August last, attention was drawn to the case by a petition on the defendant's behalf, and I carefully examined all the representations. But I saw no reason to differ from the opinion of my predecessor that the Secretary of State could not interfere; and I do not think that there is any further inquiry that could usefully be made.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

Sir GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if the accounts of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund are audited; and, if so, by whom; and whether he would give instructions for a copy of such accounts to be sent (after audit) annually to all the Metropolitan unions, parishes, or places contributing to the fund.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Statements showing in great detail the expenditure repayable out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund are submitted by the several Boards of Guardians to the district auditor and are corrected and certified by him. These statements are then forwarded to the Local Government Board, and are carefully examined and checked by the receiver and his assistants. Printed summaries are sent every half-year to Boards of Guardians in the Metropolis showing under thirteen different headings the expenses incurred by each of them which are repayable from the fund, and also as regards each union the rateable value, the amount of the contribution assessed, the expenditure repayable, and the net amount contributed or received. These summaries are subsequently published in the Annual Reports of the Local Government Board. It does not at present appear to me that anything further is necessary in the direction indicated by my hon. friend.

South African War—Rewards for the Electrical Engineers.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that five companies of electrical engineers in South Africa, nearly all highly skilled professional men, who gave up lucrative appointments for the service of their country, received ordinary soldiers' rate of pay; that they furnished upwards of eighty working parties, and successfully carried out all kinds of electrical installations for light, power, and communication in connection with hospitals, bridges, camps, and blockhouses over an extensive territory; and whether any Volunteer officer or man in this recently returned battalion has received any distinction or reward; and, if not, whether it is contemplated to recognise their service in any way.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The electrical engineers received the ordinary rates of pay like the other Volunteers serving in South Africa. The valuable and excellent work performed by them was fully appreciated by Lord Kitchener. Three officers were mentioned in despatches, and the sergeant-major received a distinguished conduct medal. In view of the scale on which rewards were available, it was not found possible in justice to others to grant further rewards.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the Secretary of State for War when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Militia and Yeomanry Bill, and if he will ensure that a reasonable time be given for its discussion.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) This Question should be addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury.

Local Government Board and Board of Trade Officials.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say why the upper division officials in the Departments of the Local Government Board and Board of Trade are placed on an inferior scale of salary to those in Departments presided over by Secretaries of State; and whether he has any official information showing that the system secures officers for the former Departments of merit equal to those in the latter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) Scales of salary are fixed in each Department in view of the nature of the work to be done in it. The salaries in the two Departments mentioned in the Question were fixed after a full and comparatively recent inquiry, and attract officers in all respects competent to discharge the duties entrusted to them.

Education Bill—Teachers in Voluntary Schools.

SIR ROBERT MOWBRAY (Lambeth, Brixton): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether teachers are included under the term officers in Schedule 3 (14); and if so, whether he will provide that teachers in voluntary schools shall be placed on the same footing as teachers in board schools for the purpose of compensation under Clauses 15 and 16.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The term "officers" in Schedule 2 (14) includes teachers. The provisions of Schedule 2 (15) and (16) are not made applicable to teachers in voluntary schools, because those schools are not transferred by the Bill from one public authority to another.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Soldiers' Families.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devonshire, Ashburton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the hardship of the continued separation from their wives and children of the non-commissioned officers and men married with leave of those regiments which by being kept in South Africa have lost upwards of three years of their home term of service; whether he will state how long this condition is to continue; and whether, in the event of these regiments not being shortly ordered home, their wives and children will be sent to South Africa.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am well aware of the hardships inflicted on the families of the men referred to, but I fear that still greater hardships would be inflicted on these families by allowing them to proceed to a country where great difficulty will be for some time experienced in providing sufficient accommodation for them. The inconvenience they undergo is unfortunately incident to active service and the present calls on the Army, and it is not possible to say how soon we may be able to alter the conditions, which we are most anxious to do.

Army Corps.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the effective strength of the First, Second, and Third Army Corps respectively, with proper cavalry divisions and admixture of reservists, that are ready at any moment to be sent abroad.

LORD STANLEY: As my right hon. friend has already explained to the House, returns of this character cannot be obtained without calling for detailed information from the Districts, an extra labour which he does not feel justified in throwing upon the officers concerned. When my right hon. friend introduces the Estimates next year he will make a full statement of our position.

MR. LAMBERT: Can the noble Lord give us no information at all?

LORD STANLEY: I have said that my right hon. friend will give the information when he introduces his Estimates next year.

Practice Ammunition for the Navy.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state if it is the case that the amount of ammunition for heavy guns allowed for practice is now the same as it was in the days of muzzle-loading guns, or what alteration, if any, has been made.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The amount of practice ammunition allowed for heavy guns is less than was formerly sanctioned in the case of muzzle-loading guns, but owing to the introduction of aiming rifles attached to the guns a great amount of target practice is obtained without the expenditure of the ordinary charges and projectiles. In one important respect, however, a change has been made in the direction of increasing the allowance of ammunition. The number of rounds expended during prize firing is now only limited by the time assigned to the practice, whereas formerly in cases where the number of rounds exceeded the quarterly allowance, the amount was deducted from the issue for the succeeding quarter. This change has been introduced with the object of encouraging accuracy and rapid firing.

Indian Native Army—Promotions of Colonels.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state why the old system of promotion of Colonels of the Native Army to Generals was stopped before the new system was introduced, and what were the special difficulties; and why for a period of three years Officers of the Indian Army were superseded by Colonels promoted Major-Generals in England under the new system.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): (1) The old system of promotion to the rank of Major-General was stopped by the Royal Warrant which fixed the date for the introduction of the new system as 1st January, 1901. The last promotion under the old system was made in October, 1900. (2) The number of appointments for Major-General and Lieutenant-General under the new system being too few to maintain a flow of promotion, it was proposed, in the interests of the Indian Army, to increase them, and correspondence has for some time been in progress with the War Office and the Government of India for that purpose. As the result of an inter-departmental Conference, certain proposals have already been accepted in principle, which will increase the number of these appointments, and, as I stated in my reply of the 13th inst., the final report of the Conference is expected shortly. In the meantime it is impossible to give effect to the new system. (3) Without accepting as correct the hon. and gallant Member's use of the word "supersession," I may point out that the first promotion of a Colonel in England under the new system took place, not three years, but less than one year ago. The new system will be applied to the Indian Army as soon is possible.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Will it act retrospectively? This hits a large number of very distinguished soldiers.

EARL PERCY: I must ask for Notice of that Question.

Increased Pay of British Soldiers in India.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will lay upon the Table the correspondence with the War Office relating to the proposed increase of pay of the British soldier in India.

EARL PERCY: The Treasury have agreed to refer to the arbitration of the Lord Chief Justice the question as to the distribution of the charge in respect of the increased pay of the British soldier in India. Until the case has been laid before him and his decision upon it received, I cannot undertake to lay on the Table any portion of the correspondence on the subject.

MR. LAMBERT: Can the noble Lord say when the Lord Chief Justice will give his award?

EARL PERCY: No, Sir.

Shanghai—Withdrawal of International Troops.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if any date has been fixed for the evacuation of Shanghai by the troops of foreign nationalities; if so, when such evacuation is to be accomplished.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): As the result of communications which have recently passed between the Powers concerned, the International troops will be withdrawn from Shanghai at as early a date and as nearly simultaneously as possible; the precise dates of their departure must depend upon the dates at which sea transport can be procured for the different contingents.

Income Tax Collection.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state under what authority revenue officers demand from public companies any further information than the names and residences of persons in their employment liable to be assessed for Income Tax.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. RITCHIE, Croydon): Information as to salaries paid by public companies to their employees is requested (not demanded) in accordance with standing instructions from the Board of Inland Revenue. The practice is of very long standing, and is considered to be in the interest of all parties concerned. But, as was stated in reply to the hon. Member's previous Question (18th November), the information is not pressed for, if any objection to giving it is raised

London County Council—Travelling Expenses of Committee.

SIR JOHN DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that personal travelling expenses incurred by the members of the London County Council, in connection with committee visits to institutions administered by the Council, and within the County of London, are defrayed out of public funds; and whether he can explain the powers under which the Local Government auditor acts in passing such items without question.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have communicated with the auditor on this subject, and he informs me that the County Council do not pay any expenses for members attending meetings of the Council or committee meetings within the county, but that in some cases where personal inspection is required the cost of the conveyance of the members making the inspection is defrayed by the Council. The auditor states that he has allowed these expenses, feeling that they were incurred in the performance of extraordinary or special duties. I am advised that although the travelling expenses of members of a local authority engaged in their ordinary duties within their district cannot be legally charged on the rates, reasonable expenses of this kind can be so charged when incurred in connection with extraordinary services. Whether any particular service is of an extraordinary character is a question to be determined in the first instance by the auditor when the expenditure is before him, but any person aggrieved may appeal to the Local Government Board against his decision.

Llangollen National Schools.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the children at the National Schools, Llangollen, were on the 7th instant, and during school hours, subjected to inquiries as to the religious beliefs of their parents, and that the children of Nonconformists were told to stand upon the forms upon that occasion; if he will state whether such a differentiation of the children was made by the direction of the managers, and what was the object of the course taken; and whether such a proceeding is in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): I have no information on the matter. If any complaint should be addressed to the Board of Education, inquiry will be made.

Sligo and Bundoran Railway.

MR TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Board of Works have received any communications as to the construction of a line of railway from Sligo to Bundoran; will he say to what extent are the Treasury prepared to help the undertaking; and in what stage do the negotiations now stand.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES-FISHER, Fulham): No communications have been received by the Board of Works on this subject; and it is clearly impossible at this stage for me to give any undertaking on behalf of the Treasury.

Irish County Infirmaries—Surcharge of Illegal Expenditure.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board, in view of the decision in the Gloucester Appeal Case in England, have issued instructions to their auditors to surcharge expenditure on county infirmaries for purposes which are prohibited by statute in the case of any of the money being provided out of the poor rate.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No such instructions have been issued. The Board has not seen the decision in the case mentioned, but will endeavour to obtain it.

Sligo and Leitrim Asylums.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what is the nature of the reports received from the inspector of lunatics as to the overcrowding of Sligo Asylum; and whether it is intended to avail of the offer of the Mohill Board of Guardians to have their workhouse converted into an auxiliary asylum, and thus save capital expenditure to the counties of Sligo and Leitrim.

MR. WYNDHAM: The substance of the report has been communicated to the Joint Committee of Management of the Asylum and published in the Press. The County Councils of the asylum district are responsible for the provision of sufficient accommodation for the insane poor in the district. No proposal has been made by them in the direction mentioned in the Question. If made, it will receive careful consideration.

Phœnix Park Constabulary Depôt.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Inspector General has received from the North Dublin Union as sanitary authority a resolution complaining of the constantly recurring cases of infectious diseases from the constabulary depôt in Phœnix Park, and what steps have been taken to enforce the sanitary laws in this instance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution has been received. All possible precautions have been taken by the depôt authorities, in consultation with the Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board, to eradicate the disease.

Shannon Development Company.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount of the subsidy paid out of the public funds yearly to the Shannon Development Company; whether his attention has been directed to the report of the county surveyor to the last meeting of the Leitrim County Council that the steamer service was not satisfactory; and what steps he proposes to take as to the future payments of the subsidy to this company.

MR. WYNDHAM: £1,000 for the year ending May next. The attention of the Commissioners of Works has not been directed to the report in question. It is not proposed to suspend payment of the subsidy payable under the existing agreement with the Company.

Sandford Estate, Castlerea.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have entered into negotiations for the purchase of the Sandford Estate at Castlerea; and if he can state the proposed terms.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

Rules of Procedure.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the House met on 16th January and is still sitting, he will consider the advisability of proposing a return next session to the former Rules of Procedure.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It is unfortunately true that the House met early this year and has been sitting late; but a confess that the somewhat protracted experience that we have thus against our will obtained has only convinced me more than ever of the necessity for the new Rules.

MR. COGHILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman intend at this advanced period of the session, when nearly three-fourths of the Members are going away, to propose that these new Rules shall be made permanent?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sure my hon. friend does not seriously make the proposal that the long discussions which we had at the beginning of the session should be absolutely thrown away, and that the whole labour should have to be repeated in a subsequent session.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Does that statement include the retention of the dinner interval?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, emphatically.

Ireland and the Education Grant.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state approximately the total amount that will be voted from the Imperial funds for the purposes of education under the Education Bill; and what is the amount of the equivalent grant to which Ireland would be entitled.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot yet tell what the equivalent grant for Ireland will be, but the hon. Member may rest assured that Ireland will not be unjustly treated. As to the sum given in this Bill for purely English purposes, it is between £1,300,000 and £1,400,000.

Business of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman inform the House what the business will be on Monday? And can he give any estimate of the course of the session, and of the probable termination of our labours ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As to next Monday, I think—especially after what my hon. friend below the gangway has said—that it would be unwise to defer to a later date the Motion to make permanent the Rules of Procedure. On Tuesday I shall propose to take the Third Reading of the Education Bill. [An Hon. Member: How many days for the Third Reading ?] I suppose that two days will be ample. How long the Bill will remain in another place, of course, it is impossible for me to say. But it is only in my more sanguine moments that I can anticipate our getting away before December 18th.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose next Monday, or any subsequent date, to take up the Order in Debate Rule, or will he leave it in its present fragmentary state ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid that that will have to remain a beautiful torso for the present.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): When will the London Water Bill be taken ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt that that will be taken on Thursday week.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, considered.

*(2.35.) Mr. SPEAKER: The first Clause, which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Dewsbury, is not in order, because it proposes to make it compulsory on the local authority to build—at the desire of any parents—a new school alongside an existing school, which would create a fresh expense, and should therefore have been moved in Committee and not on the Report stage. The next new Clause stands in the name of the hon. Member for the Elland Division, and it appears to me to be out of order as a new Clause, because it might be moved as an Amendment to sub-Section 1 of Clause 4. It appears to provide for the abolition of religious tests in training colleges. Clause 4, however, already provides that in such institution no pupil shall be excluded or placed in an inferior position on account of his religious belief. It appears to me an Amendment might be introduced there which would meet the point the hon. Member wishes to raise.

*Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): May I point out that Clause 4 refers only to such colleges as are maintained or aided by the county. But most of the colleges for the training of teachers are at present assisted out of national funds and not out of local rates. The majority of the colleges would not therefore come under this Section.

*Mr. SPEAKER: But I think it would be possible to introduce words which would bring those colleges within the operation of the Clause.

*Mr. TREVELYAN said he proposed to move the next new Clause which stood in his name, which would provide for really free education in all public elementary schools. The Act of 1891, about which the Party opposite had boasted so much, had not nearly provided for free education throughout England. At present about one-ninth of the children in public elementary schools still paid fees, and the majority of these children were in Church schools. In fact, 621,682 children were at the present moment paying fees, and of these 384,000 were in Church schools, and only 72,000, or barely one-ninth, were in board schools. This showed that the real reason for the maintenance of the fee system was to provide additional support to the voluntary schools. The total amount of fees received was £231,000. of which £121,000 came from Church schools. Only £41,000 came from board schools. When the Bill of 1891 was under discussion the hon. Member for Northamptonshire attempted to insert a proviso which would have made all board schools practically free—he in fact proposed that where a fee grant was given, the schools should necessarily be free. The right hon.

Gentleman the Member for the Dartford Division, who was then at the head of the Education Department, said the immediate result of having free schools everywhere would be the absolute destruction of private schools. No doubt at that time that was a perfectly intelligible policy for those who supported voluntary schools, as, had fees been abolished, many of those schools could not have been continued, or would have had to be handed over to the School Boards. But the situation had been entirely changed by this Bill. The voluntary schools would be maintained out of the rates, except in respect of the fabric. The sum required for the maintenance of the fabric would be enormously less than the present subscriptions; and from ancient endowments and rent from the teachers' houses the managers would have an additional fund besides the subscriptions to maintain the fabric of the schools. Why was it that, now that all these schools would be on the rates, a certain section of the population who were fee-payers and ratepayers should continue to be fee-payers? Why should not the whole sum required for the maintenance of the schools be paid out of the rates? There was only one possible reason why the fee-paying system should be maintained: it was because part of these fees as the Bill stood might go in lieu of subscriptions in assisting voluntary subscribers to maintain the fabric. Where the voluntary subscribers were too few or too niggardly to provide sufficient money for the maintenance of the fabric, it was hoped that the amount would be made up out of the fees. Was it worth while to keep up the system of fee-paying which alone stood in the way of a complete system of free education throughout England? They were now granting an additional £1,200,000 in aid of elementary education; surely out of that they might provide for the abolition of the quarter of a million sterling now charged in fees. In America, education was free from top to bottom, and surely it was time that the lower grades of education were made free in this country. Our poorer classes, if they had to strain their slender resources in order to educate their children, ought to be able to devote them to increasing their chances of higher education.

New Clause—

"From the first day of January, Nineteen hundred and four, any school where fees continue to be charged shall cease to be reckoned as a public elementary school."—(*Mr. Trevelyan*).

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that the question of fees was discussed in Committee at some length a few days ago. What was proposed by the hon. Member was to take away from the local authorities the option left to them in the Bill to allow fees to be charged, side by side with the obligation to provide free places in the area for every one who wanted them. The objection to the new Clause was on account of the restraint it imposed on the local authority in a matter in which the local authority might fairly be left to use its discretion. Take the case of a school which was supported by the contributions of the parents of the children attending the school in the form of fees. It might be desirable, in the view of the local authority, that this school should continue to be so maintained; that it should not be chargeable on the local authority, but maintained by the managers with the assistance of fees. The Committee, however, were asked to override the opinion of the local authority and the wishes of the parents, in order to obtain a symmetrical system in which no fees need or could be charged. The hon. Member desired to destroy the voluntary schools.

MR. TREVELYAN: I never said that.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Not in so many words; but I do not think I am doing the hon. Member an injustice by thus construing what he did say.

MR. TREVELYAN: My point was that denominational subscriptions could easily be found for denominational purposes.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON hoped he had not said anything to suggest that the hon. Member supposed that voluntary subscriptions would not continue to exist, but the hon. Member certainly held out as his ideal a system under which schools were not only maintained but provided out of public funds; and in order to attain that symmetry he was prepared to set aside the wishes and inclinations of the district and of the people who were willing to pay fees, which they need not do unless they liked. He hoped that the Clause would not be accepted by the House.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said there was a great deal to be said for leaving the question to the local authority; but the main point was, what was to be done with the fees if they were retained? He objected to easing off the situation for the managers of the voluntary schools, and to the provision of certain fees in order that the managers should meet the obligation to keep up the fabric.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I said it would ease the situation generally, not only for the managers, but for the local authority, who might not find it easy to raise sufficient money at once.

DR. MACNAMARA said he looked on the Government proposal as a distinct breach of an earlier understanding under which the managers were to provide for the upkeep of the fabric. It was not right that parents should be called on to pay fees in order to relieve the managers of the obligations imposed on them. The hon. Member for the Stretford Division, at an earlier stage of the Bill, said the measure cast a heavy burden on the owners of the school, but they were bound to bear it in return for certain advantages which were being conferred on them. The hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Board of Education undertook that the fabric should be repaired and maintained by the owners, and he strongly objected to using fees for the purpose. He did not object to the levying of fees for higher education, but what he did say was that if fees were imposed in the future they should be handed over to the local authorities for the purposes of higher education.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said the hon. Member for the Elland Division had moved a Clause which, if carried, would have the result, in many cases, of so starving the voluntary schools that they would not be able to fulfil their obligations, and would so become chargeable, to the public. He was bound to protest against this attempt to bring about this result which the hon. Member desired, because he represented a very poor constituency which had a great number of voluntary schools to which the people were much attached, and which were only maintained with difficulty, owing to the poverty of the people. In that constituency it was not the case of subscriptions being vastly in excess of the requirements for repairs, it was distinctly the reverse, yet the people were willing, out of their small means, to pay something towards the schools (in which often they had been educated themselves) for the education of their children, rather than send them to the board school next door.

MR. WHITE RIDLEY (Stalybridge) said he did not apprehend that many people would quarrel with the principle that elementary education should be free but there were districts, especially near Manchester, where the Clause proposed by the Member for the Elland Division would inflict real hardship. The hon. Member said there was no reason why people in these towns should pay school fees. There was a very good reason. In many cases these fees actually took the place of subscriptions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Why should not they be represented as subscribers, then?

MR. WHITE RIDLEY: And those fees would go towards the maintenance of the fabric, as it was only right they should. The Resolution, if carried, would result in the absolute destruction of many of the voluntary schools. Near Manchester, the carrying of this Clause in many cases would result in shutting up many of the voluntary schools for want of funds.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he had himself raised this question by a similar Amendment to the Free Education Bill in 1891. Then he had been met by the hard case of many schools with high fees in the North. But now all these schools were to have, not merely the fee grant, but the rates, and the case was already different. Both the previous speakers had dwelt upon the extreme poverty of the districts which they represented, but that only added to his surprise that they should have been so anxious that these people should have been put into an almost compulsory position with regard to the payment of fees. Whatever might be said as to the feeling of the parents, whether these parents voluntarily contributed these fees to keep up this type of school or not, the House knew perfectly well that these schools had been built by persons not in that position of extreme indigence to which the hon. Member had alluded. These schools had been built by clergymen and Churchmen living in these districts and possessing ample incomes. It was absolutely ludicrous to talk of the poverty of the Churchpeople of Lancashire, who could perfectly afford to pay for the repairs. The Roman Catholics were poor, no doubt, and out of their poverty they had maintained their schools with credit. The two hon. Members who had just spoken were among those who, if he remembered aright, a few days ago, had refused to give free representation to the parents of the children attending the schools by way of votes for the election of the managers of the school; and it was monstrous that the parents should be treated as a pawn to be pushed first this way and then that just as it suited the game of hon. Members and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Even if the parents had such a spirit of devotion to the Church that they preferred to pay fees, the Church ought to have the manliness not to levy contributions on these poor people for the purposes of a building fund, which they were quite able to provide.

(3.15.) SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) pointed out that this was not a question merely of voluntary schools. There were a great many fees paid in board schools, chiefly in the North of England. The policy of the Board of Education had always been to prohibit the opening of fee-paying schools by School Boards, but they had been unable to carry out that policy because School Boards had demanded such schools in deference to the strong wish of parents Hon. Members could easily conjecture the reasons which influenced parents in that desire. One strong reason was that by paying fees they were able to get a more advanced education for their children. This class of school in the North of England were extremely good schools, and they were greatly valued by those who sent their children to them, and it would be a misfortune if anything were done to interfere with a system which had worked so well. The moral he drew was that it would be much better to leave the question to the local authority, who would understand the needs and wishes of the people, and would not charge fees unless the population served by those schools so desired. Under the law every parent who wished for free education for his children had a right to it, so that no harm would be inflicted on the parents by giving the local authority power to charge fees.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that although this was not entirely, it was, in the main, a volunary school question, as out of £240,000 charged in fees only £40,000 was charged in board schools. It was not a question of the freedom of the local authority. As Parliament was now making a large additional grant, the House was entitled to insist on the schools being free. The cases mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University were not at all applicable. The board schools in which fees were charged were usually called "higher grade," and some parents preferred to send their children to them because they thought a better class of pupils were found there. If the local authority insisted on a *quid pro quo* in the way of a superior education, something might be said in favour of this freedom being given, but it was simply a question of class distinctions which ought not to be encouraged. Moreover, these schools were the exception. The schools really concerned were those in the poor districts mentioned by the hon. Member for Stalybridge, who had said it was a hardship that these parents should not be allowed to pay fees. Why a hardship on the parents? In the poorer districts the fees were paid out of the food of the children. Where was the hardship of a rich County Council like that of Lancashire, when a large additional grant was being made, refusing to allow these schools to be subsidised at the expense of the poorest classes of the community? It was no hardship to the parents. To whom was it a hardship? Prior to this Bill, it had been a hardship to voluntary schools, but now the whole cost of maintenance was to fall on the rates. The hon. Member for Stalybridge had thrown considerable light on the whole situation. He had said that in these districts there were no subscribers in the ordinary sense of the word, but that these parents who paid fees were really the subscribers. Then why were they not given the voice in the management of the schools to which subscribers were entitled? They were subscribers merely for the purpose of paying out of their poor pittance, and not for the purpose of any of the privileges of subscribers. In 1891 a large sum of money was given with the object of wiping out fees. Fees were not wiped out. That, to begin with, was a distinct breach of faith with Parliament. The money, according to the hon. Member for Stalybridge, was used as subscriptions to keep the voluntary schools together, and now a further sum of £1,200,000 was to be drawn upon for the same purpose.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he approached the question from a standpoint of impartiality, because, so far as his co-religionists were concerned, fees were charged in very few schools, and his argument was not at all based on their case. The assumption had been prevalent that by giving this power to the local authorities a new present was in some way being made to the managers of voluntary schools, but this assumption was wholly unfounded. The question really affected only a certain number of Church of England and Wesleyan schools. To some it was not a matter of importance, but to a great proportion it was a serious and burning question. In a large number of cases the schools had been run practically at the cost of the Government grant, plus fees, and if the fees were done away with the managers would still be saddled with the burden of repairs, but would have to find some entirely new source of income to meet it. He instanced schools in Lancashire and Yorkshire which, if fees were abolished, would annually be worse off under this Bill to the extent of £24, £19 10s., £22, £42 10s., £30, and £43, respectively. Formerly it was possible to pay the rent out of the aid grant, but that would now be impossible. The question of enlargements, which would be a serious item in the future, was not taken into consideration at all. The wealth of the Church of England had nothing to do with the question. Of what use was it to a struggling parson in the slums of Manchester to know that a parish in the South of England had large endowments? The individual case had to be considered. Under the Bill many schools would be in a worse position than before, and the only hope of some was that they should be allowed a portion of the fees, which in the past had been freely paid, and in the future would be cheerfully continued by the parents for the sake of the education they desired.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said if there was not a bargain, there was, at any rate, a balance of consideration that if the managers did certain things the State would undertake other things. If they did not call that a bargain, it was fair to at least call it a balance of consideration. The hon. Member for the Brightside Division had given an extraordinary balance sheet about one or two schools in Lancashire. In order to make out the severity of the burden of repairs upon the managers, the hon. Member estimated the cost of repairs at 2s. 6d. per scholar. Upon what authority did he state that the cost came to 2s. 6d. a scholar?

*MR. JAMES HOPE said the cost under the London School Board was 5s. 3d. He had deducted 1s. for repairs to furniture, and a very liberal and ample reduction on account of the increased expenditure in London. If, therefore, he had put it at 3s. instead of 2s. 6d. he would not have been over the mark

*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that the question of how fees are to be dealt with does not arise under this Clause. I perhaps allowed the hon. Member who has just sat down to go a little further than I should have done, but the discussion must not be continued.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he thought that the statement was exaggerated. Respecting the charging of fees by School Boards, so far as the North of England was concerned, fees were charged in higher grade schools. But this Clause would not prevent fees being charged in such schools, because it did not apply to them. It was also said that a parent could secure free places for his child. Very great demands had been made for free places, and refused, while the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University was responsible for the Education Department. He was pretty certain that in one Church of England school in Southport free places were asked for and refused.

SIR JOHN GORST: I can assure the hon. Member that no parent was ever refused a free place when he demanded it during the time I had the honour of being the Vice-President of the Board of Education.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: The right hon. Gentleman always refused to grant free places in a particular school if he thought that accommodation could be had in another school of another religion, and which might be miles away from the residence of the parents.

SIR JOHN GORST: I must correct the hon. Member. The idea was, on the part of some parents, that they had a right to acquire free places in a particular school, but parents have no such right. What they have a right to is this—free places for their children in schools most convenient and available for the purpose.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: What is meant by a convenient school? Is there any regard for distance?

SIR JOHN GORST: Oh yes.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: But convenience does not cover the word "suitability." Surely that is a matter that should enter into the consideration of every parent in regard to education. I remember another place near Hyde.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see how this bears on the question.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: At any rate, whatever the law may be, it is the practice of the Education Department to make it practically impossible for parents to secure free places for their children in these schools. There has been a great amount of friction and difficulty, almost insurmountable, for parents to secure free places where they want them. The Clause would only secure the rights of parents to send their children to any school where they wished to send them.

(3.38.) Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 101; Noes, 167. (Division List No. 575.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Newnes, Sir George

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Runciman.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Saville
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J. H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson Sir H. M.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(3.50.) LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said the Clause he rose to move consisted of two proposals—a proposal to give the right to parents to take their children out of any public elementary school and have them taught their own religion outside—a right which it was only proper to give to parents; and a proposal to give the right to the local authority to allow the parents to procure special religious instruction inside the schools. He wished to emphasise the latter point, because he had seen this Clause referred to as giving what was called the right of entry. Strictly speaking it did not do that. Strictly speaking it gave to the local authority the right to secure the right of entry, but it did not give that right outright in itself. It did not give the right to send a minister of any denomination into the school to give religious instruction. The other portions of the Clause were merely intended to safeguard the Conscience Clause, and to give to the Board of Education the power of interpreting the meaning of the word "reasonable." What were the arguments used for and against a proposal of this kind? First of all, it was said that such a proposal would be unworkable. He could not conceive why there should be any difficulty whatever in working a proposal to allow children to be taken out of school during the religious hour. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had what he thought was a reasonable Amendment on the Paper which would remove any possible objection by procuring a register of attendance, so as to prevent the Clause being used for juvenile enjoyment, which of course was not intended. He believed that a provision of this kind had actually been used in certain School Board districts. He understood that Orpington was one of the places where this provision was in operation. The London School Board had been repeatedly asked to adopt such a provision, but they had always refused. He might say that so long as there were medals for attendance, so long would they have a strong and laudable spirit among children to secure the medal for attendance. It was very difficult to work the Conscience Clause if parents were not permitted to take the children out of school, and it was difficult to induce the children to withdraw if they forfeited the merit of good attendance. In a large number of cases the parents were satisfied with the teaching given in the schools. But if a child was withdrawn from the school and sent to a church or other convenient place for religious instruction, the religious hour should count as if the child had been in the school. In respect to the other proposal, to allow special instruction inside the school, he believed the objection that it was unworkable was equally unfounded. The fact was, as everyone knew, that in the great majority of the schools two forms of religion would satisfy the demand that was at all likely to be made by parents. In the case of a small South of England rural parish, if they had the Nonconformist special instruction, or such Bible instruction as met the views of the Nonconformists, given in one class room, and the Church teaching given in the remaining rooms of the school, it would be found that every one in the parish had practically the religious teaching which was desired. There were practically only three religious denominations—the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, and the Nonconformists. In some cases they found Jewish children, but they were already provided with special instruction, for all intents and purposes, by the School Boards where they had to do with Jewish populations. At any rate, the Clause he proposed met the difficulty of unworkability by leaving complete discretion to the local authority They were to have regard to the suitability of the buildings, and they were not obliged to set up separate religious instruction unless they properly could do so. The Clause would not force on the schools any particular system whatever, nor did it force any system on the local authority. It was left open to the local authority to take that course which they believed, having regard to the rights of conscience and the suitability of the schools, was, on the whole, best calculated to meet the exigencies of the occasion. There was a third argument. It was said that no proposal of this kind was wanted. He believed that to be a mistake. Surely it could not be argued that the great system of denominational schools, supported by more than one denomination in the country, had been kept up for years, and yet that there was not in the mind of a large proportion of the population a desire for that great system of denominational instruction. He was sure that hon. Members opposite would be the last to say that there was no desire among Nonconformists for a denominational system of instruction, or a Nonconformist system, in cases where they were obliged to attend Church schools. The House had heard at great length, and with great vigour, the grievances of the Nonconformists in connection with what were called the single-school areas in different parts of the country. He did not in the least believe that there could have been so much stir about religious teaching, if, after all, the agitation was a sham. The theory that the stir was all got up between ministers of religion on one side and another was profoundly untrue to human nature. They could not stir up a community in that way unless there was something behind. Therefore he always had believed that there was reality in the religious difficulty. He believed that such a Clause as this was wanted. Suppose it was used as little as the Conscience Clause itself had been used, it would still be of value. People might be content with a form of religious instruction not exactly to their taste, if they knew that they had the power to remedy this if they chose to exercise it. He remembered that the late John Stuart Mill once said that, if he did not leave London from one year's end to another, he would yet consider it a hardship if he were confined to London by law. In the same way there were a great number of people who might acquiesce in the teaching of the Church schools who would feel it a grievance to be obliged to do it. He thought, therefore, this Clause would be of real value if never used at all. It would be of value in the same sense and degree as the Conscience Clause, which, as was well known, had been used in only a very small number of instances. Another objection to this Clause was that it was said that it would introduce the sectarian spirit among children, and inspire them with feelings of religious animosity which were not suitable to anyone, but particularly to those of very tender age. He thought that that argument did injustice to the Christian teaching whether of Churchmen or Nonconformists. He had read the Church Catechism and the Free Church Catechism, and there was nothing uncharitable or hostile in them to any other denomination. The views of these documents were set out as the truths of religion. What was taught was taught as a positive religious system, not polemically or in any uncharitable spirit. A child was dull indeed if it did not soon become aware that every one in the country was not of the same religious belief. A child could not go along the street without seeing more than one place of religious worship, and if he had any observation he would come to ask why one set of people went to one church, and why another set went to another church. It was hardly possible to walk along the streets of our towns or on the village green without seeing more than one place of religious worship; and any child of observation and intelligence would soon begin to ask why that was so. A child to be religiously brought up must actually undergo that very process of ear-marking which was supposed to make the child a bitter sectarian. It seemed to be thought that that system had a mysterious polemical effect on a child's mind, and that the child for the first time, plunged, with an evil joy, into the theological whirlpool. He was entirely incredulous of that objection. He was persuaded that those who put forward that objection were taking up a position which was in a high degree intolerant and narrow. They were trying to urge on the people of this country the view that they ought to be satisfied with some form of undenominational teaching, and that if they were not so satisfied they were bigoted and narrow-minded persons. That consideration brought him to ask the House to reflect what the alternatives were to adopting a proposal such as that which he put forward. Suppose they left the matter as it stood in the Bill, then they had a system of compensating injustices. No one denied that there was a hardship to Nonconformists where there was only a Church school to go to; and there was also an injustice to Church children if they had to attend a board school. But there was a kind of doctrine that, because Nonconformists suffered in one district and Churchmen in another, that was a sort of compensation, and that A, who was aggrieved as a Churchman, ought to find consolation in the fact that B, a Nonconformist, suffered analogous treatment in the next parish but one. That had always seemed to him a profoundly illogical view. He thought that was the system which, if the Amendment were not carried, would be continued. There would be two sets of schools, each inflicting injustice on a particular set of victims. He could not help thinking that as long as that system were maintained there would be no end to the religious question, which would still continue to be a thorn in the foot of educational progress. If they did not have the existing system, they must have a universal undenominational system which, he thought, they were beginning—some hon. Members opposite included—to understand was a system which worked a great injustice both to Roman Catholics and the Church of England. The main injustice was that the system of religious teaching which was given omitted from its sphere all those matters which Churchmen and Roman Catholics considered not indeed intellectually fundamental, but most essential to the vital practice of religion. These matters were left out altogether or treated as if they were of secondary importance, and by an inevitable tendency the children were led to believe that they were of secondary importance. He had suffered so severely from using metaphors, because they afforded such an opportunity to some critics of representing his meaning differently from what he intended, that he almost trembled at the idea of venturing on another, all the more especially as he saw the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire in his place. Yet he wished to say that to offer people undenominational teaching instead of denominational, was like saying to a person who wanted a particular kind of tree—an oak or a beech—"We cannot give you that; we will give you another kind of tree, but we will strip off the bark and leaves so that you will not know what it is, and you can add the bark and leaves afterwards." The answer would be that, however fundamental the wood of the tree might be, the life of the tree ran through the bark and the leaves. So the life ran through the very heart of the religious system about which denominations differed. There only remained universal secularism, which was repulsive to the religious instincts of the people. It would lead children to believe religion a less important matter, and in many cases the parents who were not specially active would in fact bring up their children without any religion at all. The only other alternative was the plan contained in his Clause—the plan of trying to bring up children, as far as practical considerations would allow, in the beliefs of their parents. This was plain justice. He thought it was also a matter for the peace of the schools and the peace of this House if this principle were once established, and they should have solved, he thought for ever, the religious question. They should be able to point to a principle which everyone would understand and appreciate, and whether to Churchmen or Nonconformists it would be an answer against any complaint or cause of grievance, and they should have founded their educational system, not on an abiding sense of injustice, but on the conviction that the State was treating all religious beliefs fairly and impartially, and having regard only to the natural principle of the rights of parents.

New Clause—

"(1) In all public elementary schools, whether provided by the local education authority or not, any scholar may be withheld from the school by his parent during any time set apart for religious observance or instruction in religious subjects for the purpose of his attending other religious observance or receiving other religious instruction outside the school, and the local education authority shall require that the times set apart in the school for religious observance and instruction shall be arranged so as to facilitate such withholding of scholars.

"(2) In all public elementary schools, whether provided by the local education authority or not, where a reasonable number of parents of scholars attending the school desire that by religious instruction other than that provided the managers should be given to their children, the local education authority may require that the managers shall (whether the religious instruction is regulated by any trust deed scheme or other instrument or not) make such arrangements as may be practicable, having due regard to the suitability of the buildings and the discipline of the school, to allow such other religious instruction to be given in the school.

"(3) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to deprive a parent of any right he possesses under Section 7 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870.

"(4) If any question shall be raised by the local education authority or by the managers of a school as to what is reasonable within the meaning of this section, every such question shall be decided by the Board of Education, and their decision shall be final."—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

(4.7.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that he assumed that the right hon. Gentleman desired to know with what feelings they on that side of the House regarded this Amendment. He had tried to ascertain what was the general feeling of his hon. friends near him. Of course it was inevitable that a clause coming from such a quarter should excite a certain amount of suspicion in certain quarters. But he thought that such feelings ought to be put aside, and the proposal be regarded on its merits, and without any reference to any view which those who were most favourable to it had quoted. He thought the speech of the noble Lord had been eminently fair and conciliatory, and had found an echo in every quarter of the House. Everybody respected his sincerity, and those who differed from him felt that in the long run and in the main they desired the same ends, though they did not reach them by the same road. As to the last part of the noble Lord's speech, in which he dwelt on the necessity for denominational education, that was a subject so large that he would pass it by in the fewest possible words. He sympathised with the noble Lord's desire that the children should be brought up to be good Christians, to be good religious men and women, whatever their creed might be. But there were three remarks he wished to make in regard to the noble Lord's speech. The first was that the noble Lord had attributed to the Church of England, as a whole, a theological view and a doctrine with regard to the attributes, powers, and rights of the Church, and the position occupied in the Christian field by a certain few, which was not shared by the Church of England as a whole. That seemed to him to be at the bottom of a great deal which had been said by the noble Lord and his friends. He had read with a great deal of interest a pamphlet by Canon Moberley, in which he tried to get at the bottom of a distinctive Christian theology and the special rights and functions which attributed special powers to the sacerdotal class—theories touching which were not only not held by the Nonconformists of England generally, nor by the Presbyterians of Scotland, but also, as he believed, by the large majority of the Church of England. He admitted that the view of Canon Moberley and the noble Lord had been, during the last forty years, a growing view, but he did not believe that it pervaded the laity generally; and he was inclined to think that the difference between that view and that of the majority of the Church of England was greater than the difference which separated the laity of the Church of England, as a whole, from the Nonconformists of this country. He must not pursue this fascinating subject, but he desired to enter a *caveat* against the view the noble Lord took when he talked of the Church teaching in respect to the right of the laity of the Church of England. His second observation was that the noble Lord attributed a far greater power of comprehending abstract propositions to children of tender years than experience had proved to be the case. He might tell the noble Lord that when he was a child in Scotland he was brought up on the Shorter Catechism, which was a more abstract document than the Church of England Catechism. They learned it with the greatest possible care, and verified the questions with Scripture proofs. They were taught to distinguish between a variety of abstract processes, and in that way they learned a good deal of dogmatic theology. But he really had never been able to think that that had produced any substantial difference in their subsequent lives. He thought, however, that when they came to years of discretion they formed their theological opinions for themselves, mainly from the Scriptures, theological reading, and sermons, and what they had read themselves; and that the small acquaintance they were able to make with the forms of theology before the age of fourteen had not had any effect on the future conduct of their lives. The noble Lord seemed to consider that the genuine religion, the test, the true essence of religion, should consist in a desire to be united with God, to love Him, and to revere Him; and in an endeavour to apply the precepts of religion to the conduct of their daily lives, and to live as Christians all their lives. True; but he did not think that that belonged, as the noble Lord seemed to suppose, to the points on which different denominations of Christians differed from one another. There again he was touching upon delicate and almost sacred ground; and therefore he would pass on with the sole remark that it was upon the reason and the relations which the Scripture set of belief in the presence of Christ and the existence of the attributes of God, that the conduct of life depended, and not upon the abstract dogmatic propositions of which the noble Lord thought so much. He would pass on to the practical working of the Amendment. His duty was very much simplified by the fact that the third sub-Section would not be moved.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Only in obedience to the ruling of the Chair. I am anxious to point out that I am still in favour of it in my own mind.†

MR. BRYCE said he understood that. No doubt the noble Lord regarded the Cowper-Temple Clause as *anathema maranatha*, and desired to have it expugned from the schools; but he understood the noble Lord was only moving the first two and the last two sub-Sections, and he was therefore relieved from the necessity of dealing in any way with the third sub-Section. His objection to that sub-Section would have been even stronger than it was to the other sub-Sections; and he was even prepared to say that for the Government to accept it, and indeed not to oppose it, would have been a distinct departure from what was said by the First Lord of the Treasury in introducing the Bill, when he stated that the Cowper-Temple Clause would not be disturbed. With regard to the first two sub-Sections, the first objection taken to them was that they would very much disarrange and disturb the working of the schools. He had taken the opinion of those who had a more practical acquaintance with the matter than hon. Members could have—schoolmasters and school inspectors—and they thought that these sub-Sections would disorganise the schools; and that nothing worse could be proposed for the organisation and the daily working of the schools and for discipline than that children should be continually taken out at a time when the schoolmaster would not be able to follow them. How was it to be known whether the children went to these external places; was there to be a register, and was a continual report from the chapel or the church where the instruction was given to be brought to the teacher to be checked? He thought that the noble Lord passed too lightly over that practical difficulty, in which, no doubt, his hon. friend the Member for West Nottingham and his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell would be able to throw further light. But there was another difficulty. The proposal of the noble Lord would not only disorganise the working of the school, it would weaken the position of the teacher, and even imply a certain reflection on the teacher, who was the head of the school and at present responsible for all education, denominational and undenominational. The teacher knew the child through every part of his work; but if the child were to be put in charge of a curate or a Nonconformist minister for some part of his work, it would be a reflection on the teacher, by implying that he was not to be trusted to do that part of the work. He was told the teachers thought that that would weaken their hold over the children, as the children would ask themselves why they were forbidden to receive this part of their instruction from the teacher, was he removed from or opposed to them, and why had they to go elsewhere to get one kind of instruction, getting another kind of instruction from the teacher? Moreover, the teacher might think that he was debarred, by this provision, from inculcating a moral precept or from giving teaching which in one aspect was moral and in another aspect religious, in the course of the ordinary lessons. Was the teacher to be allowed to point a moral by applying morality to religion, or to assume a knowledge of religious facts in the teaching of history? If the teacher was precluded by a provision of that kind from having anything to do with the whole subject of religion, the teacher might feel that it was a forbidden sphere, and that he must not, in other parts of his work, venture on it.

---

† The sub-Section not moved was as follows: "Where a reasonable number of parents as aforesaid desire religious instruction for their children other than that provided by the managers of the school, the local education authority may, if they think fit, make provision for the giving of such other religious instruction, whether inside or outside the school, and if outside the school for such accommodation for the purpose as in the circumstances of the case may appear to be reasonable."

Lord HUGH CECIL asked, what about the Conscience Clause?

Mr. BRYCE said that the Conscience Clause had worked because the teachers had the good sense to observe it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had stated that if there were no religious difficulties it was because the teachers had the good faith and the good feeling not to touch them. The reason why the Cowper-Temple Clause had worked was because it was understood by the teachers as preventing them from trespassing on ground it was not desirable for them to enter on. Having regard, therefore, to the importance of the place which the teacher held, they all agreed that he might as far as possible have a free hand, and not feel himself cut off from any particular kind of moral teaching; and that it would be a pity to break through the existing system in that way, by sending children outside or bringing other persons in. As to evils of segregating children, of cutting them into little distinct blocks, and marching them off, at an early age, as the sheep and the goats, such a course could not fail to injure this real religious sense. The noble Lord said that if they went to the Church Catechism they would not find any spirit of hostility or want of charity inculcated in its doctrines. That was perfectly true. They were not to be found in the doctrines themselves; and they all hoped that the Nonconformist minister on the one hand, or the curate on the other, would not teach the children to hate one another. At the same time, the mere fact that the children were drawn asunder, and that it was represented to them that they could not have religious instruction in common at a time, when they were not alive to the reasons, was, he thought, an injury to the children's lives, and an enemy to that sense of common citizenship, which they all wanted to inculcate. It would be a great pity if the children were to learn, any more than could be helped that religious differences went so deep. The noble Lord said the child would see on one side of the street a church, and on the other a Nonconformist chapel. But why emphasise the fact of these differences; why carry the separation of the Sabbath into the days of the week? That was aggravating the evil. If, as the noble Lord admitted, it was an evil, there was no gain at all comparable to the loss which was involved in endeavouring to emphasise in the minds of children the differences which separated their parents. The parents were not separated for purposes of friendship, marriage, and social intercourse, and why should social separation be introduced among the children? The noble Lord said that they, on that side, alleged that the scheme he proposed was not wanted. He listened with particular interest to that part of the noble Lord's speech, because they had felt from the very beginning of the debates that, whereas it seemed to be assumed on the other side that there was a strong demand on the part of the laity of the Church of England for denominational teaching, they on this side never had the smallest evidence as to the existence of such a demand; and he was therefore curious to know what evidence the noble Lord would give. The evidence of the noble Lord was that the voluntary schools had gone on for the past thirty or forty years, and that there must surely be a desire for sectarian education if the voluntary schools had been kept up all these years. There was a very much simpler explanation, which was that there had been on the part of a numerically small but very active and energetic section of the population, an active force working for the keeping up of the voluntary schools—the force of the clergy and the small section of the laity that worked with them. He did not in the least complain of that zeal, as it was accompanied by conscientious motives which he respected; but it was zeal on the part of a small number of persons. The only force of the general body of the laity was *vis inertiæ*, the disposition to acquiesce, to let things go on, and not take the trouble to change them. Further, it was common knowledge that the main reason why voluntary schools existed was because people did not want to rate themselves for School Boards. The noble Lord had said that two injustices did not make justice, and he admitted it was an injustice that the Nonconformist child should be compelled to go to a Church school, but he also said that it was an injustice for them to go to a board school. The Nonconformist parent did not want his child to be taught something that he did not approve of, but in the board school the child of the Church of England parent was not taught anything that the parent disapproved of. There was thus a great difference between the two cases. A very large number of Nonconformist children were obliged to go to Church of England schools because there was no other school available; but in the board schools there were at least a million children belonging to the Church of England, although by far the larger number of the schools were in populous districts where voluntary schools were equally available. The evidence was overwhelming that the bulk of the Church of England parents were not sensible of any injustice, and there was no evidence whatever of a demand for any alternative to the existing system as far as the board schools were concerned. Why then should they disturb a system which, in the words of the right hon. Member for Cambridge University, had worked well and smoothly for so long, and against which there were practically no complaints, in order to introduce a system fraught with very great difficulties?

LORD HUGH CECIL said if the right hon. Gentleman looked at the next sub-Section he would see that that was safeguarded.

MR. BRYCE said it might be so, but it ought to be safeguarded here. As the Clause stood, a child could not be withdrawn except for this particular purpose, and, so far as the inside facilities were concerned, the difficulties of that system were well known. It had been tried at Birmingham and had had to be dropped because it did not work. Bringing ministers into the schools would be most embarrassing and disturbing to the daily work of the school. The noble Lord said they had only to provide for two types of religious instruction, but that was not so. In the Church of England itself there were two types which differed fundamentally from one another, and it was just as necessary to protect the parent who belonged to the Evangelical type from the teaching of the Romanising type, as the Nonconformist parent from either.

LORD HUGH CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman proposed nothing to protect either one class or the other.

MR. BRYCE said, on the contrary, they proposed local popular control. They believed, and they were confirmed by the experience of Scotland, that where they had such control these things would work properly. If they were allowed to try that experiment they would promise that there would be religious peace. He sympathised with the main objects which the noble Lord had in view, but believed that he was taking the wrong road altogether. He thought that if the changes which the noble Lord proposed were introduced it would end in landing them in a purely secular system. He dared say that would happen in any case after a lapse of years, for if they looked abroad they saw that that was the solution at which democratic countries like the United States and the British Colonies had arrived. He did not believe that it was the general desire of the people of this country, but if they emphasised denominational differences, and put religious teaching into the hands of ministers of religion instead of the teachers, he believed it would end in religious teaching being relegated either to the Sunday school or to other times and places.

(4.35.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman's opening sentence suggested that his silence after his noble friend sat down was an indication of some perplexity as to the course he ought to follow in regard to the Second Reading of this clause. He did not at all deny that some perplexity existed in his mind, though probably the right hon. Gentleman mistook its character and origin. On the general merits of the scheme proposed by his noble friend, and on the side to which the mere argumentative balance fell, he had very little doubt. The right hon. Gentleman, towards the end of his speech, had a passage which filled him with amazement. He said "Only adopt the Scottish system, and we on this side promise you religious peace." When had they made this interesting discovery as to the methods by which religious peace could be secured? He had read many speeches, pamphlets, and observations of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and especially of the Nonconformist element, but he had never seen it suggested that what was desired by the Nonconformists and by hon. Gentlemen opposite was the adoption of a denominational system in public provided schools.

MR. BRYCE said he was not advocating the Scottish system at all. He thought that system a great deal better than this Bill, and if it were offered in exchange for this Bill he would take it immediately. What he had said, in answering the noble Lord, was that the difficulties now arising with regard to religious teaching in the schools would not exist under the Scottish system.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR admitted that he was in some doubt, which was not wholly cleared away by the explanation, as to what it was the right hon. Gentleman wanted. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman thought that denominational schools would be satisfactory to a Roman Catholic or an Anglican minority.

MR. BRYCE: I did not say denominational schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At all events, that was the kind of education that was given in a large number of Scottish public elementary schools. He was a great admirer of the Scottish system, but he never heard that it had reconciled Roman Catholics or Anglicans to the Shorter Catechism, and it was absurd to say that that system, with all its great merits, produced universal religious peace; on the face of it it could not. He thought there were in it many superiorities over the English system, but neither the English nor the Scottish system produced that universal religious peace which they all desired, although he thought that even the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to secure it. The right hon. Gentleman, he thought, made a very unfair attack upon the motives which induced his noble friend to move this Amendment, and on the speech which he made in introducing it. His noble friend's opinions on theological subjects were not shared by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, by the great body of Nonconformists, or by a large number of the English Church. But he did not hear a single word fall from his noble friend in the course of his extremely interesting and moderate speech which had the smallest reference, direct or indirect, to the theological and religious views which, as everybody knew, he held. He recommended his Amendment on grounds absolutely independent of any particular religious belief whatever, and his speech might have been made by any member of the Church of England, by any Wesleyan, by any Roman Catholic, and it would have been just as appropriate in their mouths as it was in his mouth. He did not wish to go into that part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech in which he touched, in a manner which nobody could object to, on some of the deeper things of religion; but he was astounded when he gathered that the right hon. Gentleman's idea was that religious teaching should be undogmatic. The right hon. Gentleman alluded in specific terms to the central doctrine of the Christian religion, than which nothing in this world was more intimately, inevitably, and necessarily bound up with dogma. He almost, for the moment, believed that the right hon. Gentleman had fallen into the vulgar and too common error of using the word dogmatic only in regard to those religious doctrines with which he happened to differ. He now came to the immediate question of the plan proposed by his noble friend. In principle he thought that plan a good one, and that in theory it was very difficult to find any conclusive argument against it, and he thought so the more after having heard the able speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. One of his principal arguments was that it was a great injury to the children to segregate them into different religious camps, and that they ought not to teach children that they could not learn religion together. That was a very good sermon against the sin of schism; but let it be remembered that every Nonconformist body in this country, and the Church of England as well, if they liked, owed its separate existence to the fact that adults, at all events, thought they could not worship together. That was the very basis on which Nonconformity rested, and he could not understand how what was an obligation upon a very large number of the adult population should be regarded as highly inexpedient when they were dealing with the younger generation. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that Christians were apt to exaggerate their differences. He wished to say nothing offensive, and he was sure he would not be suspected of saying anything offensive, to the great Nonconformist bodies, but his opinion was, and always had been, that many of the causes which brought these separate religious organisations into existence were insufficient causes, and it had been a great national and religious misfortune that the segregation of the population consequent upon these divisions had ever come into being. But they had to take facts as they unhappily found them, and, deeply as he deplored these religious divisions, he did not see that they made things much better by saying—"Let us admit that everybody when they grow up must differ, but so long as they are children let us assume they can agree." He saw no answer to that at all. He was sorry these divisions had come into existence, he believed many of them were wholly unnecessary, but if they existed and were to be maintained, he did not see how they could be maintained only in regard to persons of mature years, and the pretence made that the evils to which they had given birth could not affect those of tender years. He so far agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that he believed his noble friend exaggerated the difficulty of educating, at all events of Protestant children of various denominations, together. Then the right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that he (the First Lord of the Treasury) was bound on behalf of his colleagues to resist this Amendment because it interfered with the Cowper-Temple Clause, and when introducing the Bill he had stated that it did not interfere with that Clause. That was a mode of interpreting Parliamentary pledges which was absolutely new and, if he might say so, utterly absurd. If his introductory speech had been inconsistent with the Bill, no doubt the First Reading would have been secured on insufficient grounds and false pretences. But the idea that because the Bill as originally introduced was not to be modified in any direction contrary to his introductory speech was one which hon. Gentlemen opposite would be the first to resent if he had used it as an excuse for not adopting some Amendment which they themselves had suggested. No such pledge was made. He would take the House so far into his confidence as to say that he had taken a great deal of trouble to prepare an Amendment, not indeed covering all the ground of his noble friend's proposal, but covering the particular subject of single school areas. That Amendment was taken through all the preliminaries short of being placed on the Paper and brought to discussion. He frankly admitted that he did not proceed with it for two reasons—each of some force separately, but which taken together, were of great practical force. One reason was that he felt perfectly confident that any such Amendment moved by the Government would create an enormous amount of controversy and friction inside and outside the House. It was perfectly true, as his noble friend had said, that there was a great body of opinion—of very highly instructed opinion—in the country which deserved to see some such solution as this of our religious difficulties. That was absolutely true, but he was convinced that when the great body of people whom the Amendment concerned, and whom his Amendment would have concerned—the country clergy and the Nonconformist ministers all over the Kingdom, and the great body of the teaching profession—considered the proposal, they would unite in the strongest opposition to it. They all knew the happy gift of imagination which enabled, or indeed seemed to require, every man who considered how this Bill would affect him to imagine the extremest and worst possible case. What would happen? Every Nonconformist minister would immediately say, "The Church of England will invade the board schools; she is a great and wealthy body, with a vast staff of competent teachers at her command; she is wealthier than we are, and will flood the board schools; we have not the same command of teaching machinery, and a provision which nominally puts us on an equality will really act in favour of our rival." That was the picture the Nonconformist would draw. What picture would the country clergyman draw? He would say, "Kenyon-Slaney may be bad enough, but if the Nonconformist minister, who, unfortunately, is not on good terms with me, is to come into my school, and interfere with the teacher and the teaching, and persuade the children who are perfectly content with my teaching to be content with it no longer, the position will be extremely embarrassing and difficult, and there will be all sorts of quarrels in my parish." Just as the Nonconformist minister regarded the board school, so he would picture the worst possible case for himself. The picture would come before him in the darkest colours and the deepest outline, and he would say, "This may be a very good way of administering theoretical justice, but I find it extremely inconvenient." And what would the great body of the teaching profession think? He believed that every public elementary teacher in the country would object to it. They would probably follow the example of the Nonconformist minister and the country clergyman and call up the worst possible picture of what might happen? They would say, "We have the task of disciplining our schools, of bringing order out of chaos; we have a very difficult task, and if our position as teachers is to be interfered with by every meddling minister of religion, Conformist or Nonconformist, within two miles of the schools, our position in the schools will be intolerable!" It was very hard to struggle with these great imaginative powers which they always found raised against any proposal of this kind. He had given a great deal of most anxious thought to the Clause. It had, in fact, given him as much anxiety as almost any other problem connected with this Bill. After framing his Amendment, he saw that the practical difficulties in engrafting it upon the educational system were so great that nothing but the most absolute security for carrying out the object for which it was designed could justify him in throwing this burden upon an already overburdened Committee. Could they say that the Amendment would actually work very successfully in practice? They had not had much experience, but they had had some, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman who preceded him in the debate was justified in his reference to the Birmingham School Board. But the Birmingham School Board tried not precisely the same experiment but something like it, and which, for the purposes of this argument, was indistinguishable. They tried in the early days of their existence this experiment, and he imagined that the School Board would have preferred purely secular education, leaving the religious teaching to the ministers of religion. He thought that by universal consent the plan did not carry out either the intentions or wishes of its framers. He had not refreshed his memory, but he thought he was not wrong when he said that the School Board which finally put an end to the experiment was the School Board in which denominationalists had a majority, and which had a Bishop of the Church of England in the chair.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): It was not a denominational school. The school was the one at Coventry.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not think he was going too far when he said the existing School Board in Birmingham was a denominational one, that it had a Bishop of the Church of England in the chair, and, as far as this School Board was concerned, they would not desire to repeat the experiment which was tried and abandoned by their predecessors. When they remembered the enormously bitter hostilities which an Amendment of this kind excited in the country, and, secondly, the very doubtful prospect of it producing any sound practical result, he felt constrained to come to the conclusion that he could not be responsible for suggesting it to the Committee even as regarded single areas, and therefore, *a fortiori*, he had to abandon a plan upon which he had much set his heart for the whole of the educational area. He had told the House exactly where he stood. He did not believe it was possible to add an immense controversial problem like this to the Bill at that stage. He did not see that it was now practical at all. If this were embodied in the Bill and they were now engaged in a debate on the Second Reading of the Bill he would go with the noble Lord without scruple; but if any vote of his in favour of reading this Clause a second time was to be taken as a pledge that the Government were going to make themselves responsible for any proposal of that kind, he thought they would be greatly misleading the House by adopting any such suggestion. Under these circumstances he could not vote against the Clause, but he should abstain from recording his vote on the question.

*(5.10.) MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the experiment suggested had been tried for many years by the Birmingham School Board under circumstances very favourable to it, and had proved to be a failure. The experiment tried by the School Board lasted over many years, and a most earnest effort was made to ensure its success, because there were many men in Birmingham who were not antagonistic to the teaching of religion in schools, but who held that the proper solution of the difficulty was the adoption of secular instruction by the State. They took special care to provide every possible facility for this teaching in Birmingham Board Schools, and it was tried under very favourable circumstances. It broke down: in the first place, because it became difficult to secure a sufficient supply of voluntary teachers; in the second place, because many of them could not teach; and, thirdly, because many of them could not maintain a decent show of order in the schools. Gradually the Birmingham Board was driven to see that religious teaching in board schools, within the limits of the Cowper-Temple Clause, was the proper solution of the difficulty, and that was the position of the Birmingham Board Schools today. He denied that there was any effective demand throughout the country for the plan proposed. He would give to the House an example to show that there was no effective demand for this kind of teaching in the country. The only locality where this demand once assumed a practical form was in the Metropolis, when Mr. Athelstan Riley brought forward upon the London School Board a modification of the religious teaching syllabus, in order to give it a more direct sectarian meaning. It was only the addition of a word or two, but it was held by the Board, by the teachers, and by the parents that the addition of those two or three words would unduly dogmatise and sectarianise the syllabus of the Board. The next London School Board election turned upon the question of direct dogmatic teaching, and the proposal was so defeated that it had never been entertained since. He believed that Churchmen as well as Nonconformists were opposed to it. He suggested to the noble Lord that he was entirely wrong in supposing that if his plan were demanded and could be brought into practice it would produce the result he desired to secure. The noble Lord desired to have religious teaching in the day schools, and he did not seek it for one Church alone; he put forward a demand which, in his view, would satisfy and appease religious quarrels and promote a higher type of religious life throughout the country. He (the hon. Member) did not think the proposal made by the noble Lord would have that effect. It was impracticable to make children understand theological distinctions expressed in theological terms, which, no matter how much they were simplified, remained terms of art. To endeavour to impress theological terms of art upon the children would leave no impression upon children's minds which was comparable to the broad religious teaching which could be given by a skilled teacher. Because he believed that, so far from improving the religious level and the real moral tone of the schools, this proposal would damage and even lower them; because he knew from his own experience as a teacher that it would interfere with the general working of the schools; and because he believed there was no effective demand on the part of the parents for this kind of teaching, he was opposed to the Clause.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) asked leave to call attention to the position in which the House stood in reference to this proposal—a position which in a long Parliamentary life he had never had any experience of before. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had, at the eleventh hour, said that he had given most anxious attention to this subject and had endeavoured to find a solution of a similar character. But he had come to the conclusion that it was utterly impracticable; that it would load this measure with a controversy of the most bitter kind; that, in his opinion, the Nonconformists would be against it; that the Church of England would be against it; and that the schoolmasters would be against it. And yet he would not vote against it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said I would not vote against the Second Reading.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would save the time of the House by encouraging the Second Reading of a Clause which would have the results which had just been described. The course the right hon. Gentleman had taken was to abandon the charge of this Bill, and to hand over to the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich the task of dealing with the religious difficulty in a Bill for national education. That was the net result of the speech of the First Lord. The First Lord would not cross swords with the noble Lord. He had said that this proposal was impracticable, and that, consequently, it would be mischievous; that it would introduce the religious difficulty in its worst form into this Bill; that everybody would be against it, and yet—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the right hon. Gentleman thinks he is correctly quoting me, he is quite mistaken. He is not representing me in the smallest degree.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the reason the right hon. Gentleman gave for believing that attempts of a similar character were impracticable was that every one would look at this Clause in its worst possible light. He described how the Nonconformist minister would think the clergy were invading the board schools; how the clergy would dislike the Nonconformist minister's going into his school; and how the schoolmaster would dislike both the Nonconformist minister and the clergyman going into the school. And yet he would not vote against the proposal. Was not that a most extraordinary conclusion for the responsible Minister in charge of a Bill of this description to come to? If a Clause that would have these consequences was carried, every class responsible for education would determine to destroy this Bill, and yet the right hon. Gentleman washed his hands of the transaction. A more remarkable situation for the head of a responsible Government he had never heard of. He believed no such example could be found in the history of the House of Commons. He did not know what was going to happen to this Clause, but he knew what was going to happen to the Bill if the Clause was carried. For his part, he should vote against a Clause which would have the consequences described by the right hon. Gentleman. He believed that this Clause, which would be like putting two game cocks into a room to fight out their religious difficulties, was one of the most mischievous proposals that ever was made to a responsible representative Assembly. It had been tried before and it had failed, and these game cocks were no longer allowed to fight in the place where they fought before. What sort of thing would happen? He read the other day something which shocked him. A child was brought to be buried, and the curate asked whether it had been baptized. The parents said "No," and he said, "Then it cannot come into the church." Then at the grave the consolatory sentences of the burial service were omitted because the child had not been baptised.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tonbridge): What has that to do with this Clause?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he was giving that as an illustration of what they had to deal with. By leaving the decision of a question which went to the root of the religious difficulty in the hands of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, whom they greatly respected, but from whom they profoundly differed, the Government were not casting oil upon the waters of religious difficulty, but rather oil upon the flames. That the religious difficulty should be left in the hands of the noble Lord, and not in the hands of the Government, did not, in his opinion, promise well for the ultimate success of this measure.

SIR JOHN GORST said that it was no part of his duty to answer the personal attack on his right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth. He had always understood that there were two stages of the proceedings on Report in regard to a new Clause. The first was the Second Reading of the Clause, when the principle on which the Clause was based was confirmed; and the subsequent proceeding was the adding of the Clause to the Bill, which was an entirely different proceeding, when the House might come to a different decision. He had not any official responsibility for this Clause. He would support the principle of the Clause by voting for the Second Reading if it went to a division, but he must insist on explaining that he did not consider himself in any way bound to vote for the addition of the Clause to the Bill unless it could be made workable, and one which would really operate in the interests of education. There was no more remarkable phenomenon in our educational system than the contrast between the profound peace that reigned in all the schools on the religious question and the violent tempests which prevailed on platforms, and, to some extent, even in this House. Why was that? The fact was that the managers of voluntary schools seconded by the teachers managed, notwithstanding the trust deeds, and notwithstanding the Cowper-Temple Clause, to give that religious instruction to the children which was acceptable to the parents of the children in the school. He did not insist that that was saying very much, for he must admit that a very large number of the parents of these children did not care what particular religious instruction their children were taught. No doubt there were very devout parents who had strong views on religious matters, but, as a general rule, the parents of children in the elementary schools were not very anxious or careful as to the particular religious instruction given to their children. But the managers of the voluntary schools not only gave religious instruction which was satisfactory to the parents, but also not objectionable to the particular denomination to which the parents belonged, even in districts where there was only one school. And the reason was that the sort of religious instruction given was not of a controversial or dogmatic character; it consisted, for the most part, of the simple teaching of the facts of Christianity directly from the Old and New Testaments. He supposed that the Parable of the Good Samaritan, if it were taught to a child by a nun, would not very much differ from that given by a sister in a Church of England Sunday school. Nor was the Church Catechism a very controversial document. A very large part of the Church Catechism was not very distasteful to many of the Nonconformist bodies. [Some cries from the OPPOSITION Benches of "Oh, oh!"] He knew that many Wesleyans did not object at all to the statements in the Church Catechism as to baptism or the Lord's Supper; and the teachers managed to teach even the Church Catechism in such a fashion in thousands of schools as to give no offence whatever to the parents of Nonconformist children. He understood that the Clause of the noble Lord was merely intended to carry out in all schools that which managers and teachers managed to carry out in thousands of schools all over the country now. It would be a slight improvement on the existing Conscience Clause. He had always thought the existing Conscience Clause defective, because it only allowed the children to be withdrawn from the religious teaching during the hour that that was given, and the children so withdrawn had to do sums or writing exercises while the religious instruction was going on. As to the second Clause of the noble Lord's Amendment, he did not read it at all in the sense suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen—that interlopers were to come into the schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction, which would be the Birmingham case revived, and which, he thought, was an extremely bad system. What he understood to be the meaning of the Amendment of the noble Lord was that religious instruction should be given to the children by the teachers of the school in accordance with the wishes of the parents; and a very large discretion was left to the local authority as to how that was to be brought about. The right hon. Member for South Aberdeen said that that had not succeeded; but it had succeeded in hundreds and thousands of schools. In the great majority o Church schools teaching was given to which nobody objected, and which was accepted by not only the parents, but by the ministers of Nonconformist bodies. There was also a very large number of board schools in which religious teaching was given of the most admirable kind, which was accepted, not only by Churchmen, but even by Roman Catholics. He had gone into schools in London where the children were receiving religious instruction to which no objection was made either by Churchmen or Roman Catholics; and he must say that he had never heard better religious instruction given them than by Nonconformist teachers, under the Cowper-Temple Clause and the rules of the London School Board. But there was a certain number of country schools in which, no doubt, there was a desire on the part of Nonconformist parents that their children should not be taught the Church of England Catechism, or the doctrines of the Church of England contained in the English Prayer Book. He did not know whether it was a violation of the trust deeds or not, but there were hundreds of schools in which one set of children received Bible lessons while another set of children, in another class room, were taught out of the Catechism and the Prayer Book. He could assure the House that that was done with the greatest possible good effect. It was for that reason that there was such profound peace in the schools in regard to this religious question. He did not deny that there were isolated cases in which too zealous school masters, or managers, had given instruction which had caused a great deal of disturbance and difficulty, but these cases were rare. He should say that there were not more than two or three in a year, while he was at the Education Department. He understood that the Amendment of the noble Lord meant that it would be the duty of the local authorities to provide, in cases of that kind, for the separate teaching of those children whose parents did not like the religious teaching given in the schools and required some other religious teaching. That would work perfectly well with the good will of the managers, and would conduce to religious peace, and the termination of religious strife on public platforms. Holding these views, he should vote for the noble Lord's proposal to amend the Bill.

(5.45.) MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) desired to call attention to the extraordinary position in which the House was placed. The Question had been put from the Chair that this Clause be read a second time. The First Lord of the Treasury had no idea of supporting it in the division lobby, but he had supported it in his speech. What would the position be if the Clause was read a second time? He supposed it would then be amended, and after Amendment the Question would be put that the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill, when the Government would reject it. Such a course was treating the House with contempt. Every one knew the Closure would fall on the debate at eleven o'clock, and it was not right to waste all this time over this Clause. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he had spent a good deal of time and thought over this Clause, and had abandoned it because he found everybody was against it, yet now this was a Clause upon which the First Lord had no mind, and he was going to run away when the division took place. He had not intended to say anything upon the Clause itself, but as it was left an open question for the House, he might say he had no hesitation in voting against it. He thought they had no right to ask the State to contribute towards teaching dogmatic religion. If the people were called upon to contribute to the maintenance of these schools, the teaching should be such as that given in the Board Schools, and should not be distinctive of any denomination. He did not wish the children to be brought up little bigots, as they would be under such a Clause In the West of England the "Bible Christians" were a very large sect, and he held in his hand an advertisement by a clergyman for a gardener, which read as follows—

> "Wanted a gardener who understands green-houses and fruit growing; good wages and comfortable home to a first-class man."

And then it says—

> "No Bible Christian or other incompetent person need apply."

What would be the state of affairs in such a parish as that if the parents were allowed to bring in different religious teachers to teach their various beliefs? It was surely ridiculous in this twentieth century to attempt to set up a system which would widen the religious differences among children. It would create the greatest confusion—a sort of theological Babel — in the rural schools.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE said he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen was right when he said there were different types and different forms of Church teaching in the various schools, because while the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was speaking he had received the following telegram — "Please oppose the Cecil Amendment. — Church Association." He opposed this Motion, however, not because he had received that telegram, but because the proposal before the House was radically bad, and would import confusion and bitterness into the schools. The main object of this proposal was that all denominations should have a right of entering into the schools and teaching their special form of religion; but there were both spiritual and practical objections to that. Those who favoured this proposal were those who looked at the schools from the outside; and those who opposed it looked at the schools from the inside. How was this sectarian canvass to be conducted? The only result could be to create wishes on the part of the parents which did not at present exist. Those who represented the Anglican Church were not very sincere in saying that they desired to consult the wishes of the parents, or, at least, it was very late in the day for them to be so solicitous of the wishes of the parents after having ignored them for the last thirty or forty years. In the 5,000 districts where there was only a Church school the wishes of the parents had been ignored. The proposal contained in the Clause could only be carried out by grace and favour of the teacher; for every one of the volunteer instructors in religion would have to have a schoolmaster beside him to maintain order. No teacher worth his salt liked the proposal. They all preferred to give the religious teaching themselves. There could be no smooth-working system if those who were hostile to it had to stand aside and keep order. He thought that it would injure the school and the children, who after all counted for something. The Committee was being asked to supersede the head teacher very frequently. Did they not think that it was a bad thing to lower his status? Did they not think that the whole future of the school and of the children depended on the opposite process—on exalting him, on making him a man of influence and of prestige among the children of his school? He also thought that they were going to divide the school against itself, to destroy the religious unity of the school. They would have the children meeting together for some common lesson and then filing into separate class-rooms to worship God apart as if there were several gods. By this Amendment they were emphasising the divisions, obscuring the radical concurrences; and in his judgment it was rather a terrible thing to obscure these great and vital concurrences. He did not know in whose interest this Clause was proposed, but he felt sure that it was not in the interest of the children. The Dissenters would not have it, and although he did not know what the Roman Catholics thought about it, they would certainly not allow any Dissenting interlopers to come into their class-rooms and proselytise their children. They would repudiate it with indignation and talk of "atmosphere." He did not think special treatment in regard to Roman Catholic schools was either practical or feasible. All voluntary schools must come into the same plan. If special facilities were given to the Roman Catholic schools, the Roman

Catholic religion would be more established in this country than that of the Church of England. The noble Lord wanted to enter the board schools, and he and his friends had taken what was called, rather absurdly, Cowper-Templeism, as if it were a system of religion. It was not a system at all; it was not a religion; it was a system of imparting religious instruction which was in some respects like the Scottish system. Members of the Church of England could enter the board schools now and teach their own doctrines. They did so now in Birmingham. The Church of England sent their teachers round, and lately they had been giving a set of discourses on the doctrine of the Trinity. This fact proved that the noble Lord's Clause was unnecessary. Anything could be taught in the board schools provided that a formulary was not used, and he could not see what the noble Lord was fighting for, unless it was for a formulary. If they abolished every formulary in Christendom he thanked God that Christianity would remain. Whether board schools or Church schools were good or bad, the religious teaching did not depend on the formulary, but upon the man. He might mention that there was one school whose services he recently attended, at which he heard a most beautiful prayer. He asked the head teacher where he got the prayer form. The reply was "I once taught in a board school, I found it there, and I brought it into this Church school." Here they had the case of a board school without a formulary exalting and spiritualising the teaching of a Church school with a formulary. What was the essential difference? The teacher believed what he taught, and that was the whole thing. No parent had asked for this experiment to be tried—the system of Christianity by compartments. The noble Lord and his friends wanted to break up the religious unity of the schools, to make them sectarian, to make the poor little children sectarian, each with his own label, a label that no angel in heaven could read. Again, they would impoverish and secularise the teaching of the headmaster, abase his calling—he upon whom only the whole tone and atmosphere of the school depended, he who on some occasions must have mute lips and could not say a word for the faith that was in him. Oh! shame on you. He listened to many speeches of the noble Lord with personal advantage, and could not see how any one with his delicacy of apprehension could support a scheme that struck him as being so monstrous and really so irreligious.

Mr. Middlemore.

(6.15.) SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he could not express in sufficiently strong terms his pleasure, as an old Birmingham citizen, at hearing Birmingham once more articulated in the House of Commons. During the School Board struggle in Birmingham they went through the various phases which had been discussed on this Bill. First, they had a School Board with a Church majority; then they had a majority whose object was to have no religious teaching whatever in the schools; and finally, they came to a compromise which had been the basis of the teaching so well described by the hon. Member for North Birmingham. The views expressed by the hon. Member were those held by a large number of people in Birmingham, because they had had practical experience of the proposals that were made. When the difficulty arose as to how religious teaching should be continued in the board schools of Birmingham, a worthy citizen carried on a campaign in favour of a scheme almost identical with that of the noble Lord. The scheme was discussed in the Press and on the platform. At first sight it was received with general approval because it seemed to provide a means of getting rid of the religious difficulty by giving an equal field and no favour to all denominations. It was tried, but had finally to be given up as absolutely impracticable. In that great city, with all its wealth of enthusiasm for education, with the various sects primed up to the highest pitch of energy, the scheme was found impracticable because sufficient teachers could not be found to carry on the work. In addition to that practical difficulty it was found that it would create a confusion and disturbance in the management of the school which would be fatal to the general scheme of education. He deprecated Members supporting the Amendment from a desire to heal religious differences. It would not heal them, it would accentuate and embitter them. It would place before the coming generation in every school the worst object-lesson they could have in religious differences. At an age when their minds were most susceptible to such impressions there ought above all things to be an attempt made to put before them a common basis of religious teaching which would not be embittered by differences between one set of children and another. He asked the House to imagine a school divided into little sects, each sect trooping off to its separate room, to receive their religious teaching from a special teacher! Anything more likely to cause differences between sections of children could not be conceived. Religious differences would be forced into the minds of the children, to become a source of religious difficulty and schism in later years. He was convinced that this system, no matter how earnestly or on how high grounds it was advocated, would accentuate the religious difficulty and cause future religious strife, rather than provide a solution which in the common interests of education and Christianity all were anxious to find.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said it seemed to be the impression of some speakers that his noble friend the Member for Greenwich and those who supported this proposal wished to recreate or to make worse the religious difficulty in the schools. Nothing was farther from their intention. The Amendment was put forward with the simple desire to get rid of that which, over and over again, had been declared in the House to be a great religious difficulty. How many times had there been put forward the hard case of the children of Nonconformist parents in parishes where there was only one school, and that a school connected with the Church of England, in which the children received religious instruction according to the doctrines of the Church of England or none at all. The number of these schools had been greatly exaggerated. As a matter of fact there were 7500 single school districts. Of those schools, only 5600 were Church of England, in which he admitted the Nonconformist grievance existed, but there were 1326 single board schools, in which Church of England parents, and those of every denomination had an equal grievance in that their children could get only undenominational religious teaching, which did not satisfy them. The contention he put forward, simply with the object of arriving at a just and common understanding, was that it was only fair in all these cases that some separate provision should be made if the parents demanded it, so that the children might obtain religious instruction in the doctrines held by their parents. He was certainly disappointed that the proposal had not met with a more liberal response from hon. Members on the other side. At the same time, he was bound to admit that the difficulties which had been urged were chiefly of a practical order. Over and over again it had been said that the Amendment would not work. How was it that in Ireland, where religious differences were greater and more acute than in this country, a similar system had been in existence for many years and was working with absolute satisfaction? He preferred the proposal with regard to facilities outside rather than facilities inside the school, because it would interfere less with the children in the school. It was said that various people who had a right to be consulted would oppose the scheme. He did not think that would be the case as far as the great bulk of the clergy were concerned, as the Prime Minister seemed to fear. Some would disapprove of it, but he believed the bulk of the country clergy, and certainly the majority of the town clergy, would be perfectly willing to make such arrangements in their schools as would enable the scheme to be carried out. Then they were told that Nonconformists would oppose it because they might have a poorer staff. His noble friend and himself had tried to meet these difficulties by a proposal which they thought was perfectly fair, and which would enable the local authority to give these separate facilities.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): What sort of facilities?

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he was afraid that he would not be in order in discussing that. Separate rooms might be hired, and certain teachers inside the school might be appointed to teach the religion of the minority. He ventured to think that the real reason why hon. Members opposed this proposal was to be found in one short sentence which occurred at the end of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, when he said, "If you will only give us popular control the whole thing will be settled." If that were so with popular control, would the right hon. Gentleman accept the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause? He would not object to complete popular control over all schools alike, provided that the Cowper-Temple Clause was abolished and the majority were allowed to decide what religious instruction should be given in every locality, coupled, of course, with such provisions in the interest of the minority as were contained in the new Clause of his noble friend.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Hear, hear!

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said that if they were agreed on that point they might arrive at a compromise. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear!"] But he observed that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen shook his head.

MR. BRYCE: I do not approve of the hon. Gentleman's proposal. I think it would be better than the Bill and I would accept it before the Bill, but, in my view, schools which receive grants from the State should give no denominational instruction.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he was in favour of popular control in the fullest sense. He objected to the Cowper-Temple Clause because it limited popular control, by preventing the people of a locality from giving in the schools of that locality the religious instruction they desired. He regretted that the two sides could not come to some agreement in the matter. For his part he would go very far indeed to get rid of the religious difficulty. But no doubt it was too late to reconstruct the Bill at this stage; and taking the Bill as it stood it seemed to him that the only way to meet the grievance of those who did not believe in the religion taught in the one school of a district was to accept the new Clause of his noble friend, which would give to the minority, whether Nonconformist or Anglican, the chance of obtaining for their children instruction in the religious doctrines which they professed.

So far from wishing to intensify religious differences, he had no object, except as far as possible to mitigate those differences, and allow the schools, untrammelled by any restrictions, to carry on the great work of education.

(6.35.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Member for Tunbridge, who had just made an important suggestion, had confined his appeal to hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House. Why did he not appeal to the Prime Minister, and to hon. Members sitting around him, who were in a majority? It did not rest with the Opposition to dictate terms upon this question, for they were in a minority, and a very small minority. He should like to know what the answer of the Prime Minister would be to the hon. Member's suggestion. He could only speak as to what happened in Wales. In Wales they did not regard it as an ideal system, but they were ready to accept what the hon. Member for Tunbridge had suggested as a good working compromise, and they were willing to proceed to act upon it. He knew it was impossible to obtain an ideal system in education or in anything else. If the Prime Minister was in the same frame of mind now he did not think it was too late for him to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Tunbridge. A great many Government Amendments had already been put down, and why could they not put a few more down to carry out the views of the hon. Member for Tunbridge. As to the new Clause, the Prime Minister had come to a rather lame conclusion in regard to it. The right hon. Gentleman had criticised it very severely, but he had given no guidance to the House as to how he desired his own supporters to act with respect to it. For all the House knew there might be a majority of hon. Members opposite who were prepared to carry it through. In that case, was the Prime Minister prepared to embody it in the Bill? He thought the Prime Minister was trifling with the House in not giving it definite guidance. If they only knew that the Government were going to resist this proposal they would not need to oppose it, and they might consider the matter at an end. The declaration of the Prime Minister meant that he was not going to take any step to get this proposal thrown out. He should like to know how they would stand if the discussion upon this Clause was kept up until eleven o'clock.

*MR. SPEAKER: The only Question to put to the House will be that the Clause be added to the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had understood that nothing but Government Clauses could be put. He understood from the ruling which had just been given that if an Amendment to this Clause was under discussion, assuming the Second Reading of the Clause was carried, at eleven o'clock it would be competent for Mr. Speaker to put the Question that the Clause be added to the Bill. If so, he thought the Parliamentary situation was a very serious one indeed as far as this Clause was concerned. They might be adding to the Bill a Clause of the very greatest importance, without a word of guidance from the Government, who were responsible for the Bill. He frankly confessed that he did not understand the position of the Prime Minister. He had seen a report of a diocesan conference where they discussed this question, and where a resolution was moved in favour of the noble Lord's Clause. One of the speakers said, "It won't be any use, because the Government will not accept it, and what is the good of wasting our time." Another ecclesiastical dignitary said, "Don't forget what happened with the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, upon which the Government changed their minds;" and the same speaker further stated that the Government had only got to be squeezed and they would give in. What they wanted to know was whether the Government were going to be squeezed into accepting this Clause in the Bill. For his part, he took a different view with regard to the general principle of this Clause from that of many of his hon. friends. He did not say that in no circumstances should they contemplate the giving of facilities to religious communities to have their particular doctrine taught in the schools. Such a system was in operation in Canada and in New South Wales, and it worked well, because in these cases there was popular control, and that made a great difference. Was the noble Lord prepared to go as far, with regard to popular control, as the hon. Member for Tunbridge?

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: Provided you abolish the Cowper-Temple Clause.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked if the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was prepared to go as far as that, because it made a considerable difference. If he was, he had been wondering why they had been arguing at this thing for six or seven months, for whatever might be said about it, the plan suggested by the hon. Member for Tunbridge was a much better solution than the one contained in the Bill. He thought that even hon. Members on the Opposition side who objected to these facilities would admit that the suggestion put forward by the hon. Member opposite was a much better solution than that which was contained in the Bill. He observed that the noble Lord opposite preferred to remain silent upon this point, and he thought this silence showed that he held a more extreme view than his hon. friend the Member for Tunbridge. He was afraid that the noble Lord was rather moving this Clause more in the interests of the sectarian schools than for a settlement of the religious difficulty. The hon. Member for Tunbridge had shown, at any rate, that he was in favour of something that would make for peace in this matter. But the noble Lord opposite was moving this proposal from a totally different point of view, because he did not suggest any proposal of the kind put forward by the hon. Member opposite. Popular control was the very essence of this matter. He would point out how it would make a difference in the working of the noble Lord's Clause. Supposing these facilities were granted to various religious denominations under the present system. What would happen? Let them face the facts of the situation, and let them consider actually what would happen. He was speaking for that part of the country which he knew best, and what would happen in Wales would be that both parties would use these facilities as a weapon to destroy one system or the other. He did not hesitate for a moment to say that in Wales they would use it as a weapon. Did the noble Lord mean to say that he and his friends would not use it as a weapon in the English counties where they had a majority, or in every Church school throughout Wales? The hon. Member did not hesitate to avow that it would be used as a means of destroying one system or the other. There was nothing wrong, or anything that any one needed to conceal about it. Let the noble Lord not press this without knowing exactly what he was preparing for himself. Suppose that in Wales there was a parish where eighty of the children were those of Nonconformist parents, and only twenty were the sons and daughters of Anglican parents. In that case the facilities provided by the Clause would be used in the way he had indicated. That was a very bad thing for the schools and they could only justify it as a means of bringing to an end the present dual system which he thought was most disastrous to education all round. As long as the present dual system was in existence, it worked unequally. What did it mean? As far as the majority of the schools were concerned, the teachers maintained by the ratepayers would be giving instruction which would be purely sectarian. Therefore, if the Nonconformists wished the dogmas of their sect to be taught, they would have to make provision and to organise for the teaching of their dogmas in the whole of the elementary schools of the land. They would not start on equal terms with the denominational schools. A good deal had been said about the theological bitterness that would be introduced. That was perfectly true. He would put this to the House as a practical matter. There were a large number of children who belonged to no sect at all. It was a mistake to suppose that all parents desired to bring up their children in the dogmas of any particular sect. The fact was, that the majority of parents were outside of all sects. Who was to take charge of that class of children? They would have disputed territories, and disputes about spheres of influence. They would have hundreds of little theological Fashodas all over the country; one theological sect saying "That boy belongs to us," and another saying "He belongs to us." In these little theological Fashodas they would have one sect fighting with another. They would have endless squabbles, and there was nothing so bitter as a quarrel about a thing of this sort. They would have at one time a child belonging to one sect, and in another week or a fortnight there would be a successful Jameson Raid, or there would be some local Major Marchand who would have the child taken away. That was exactly what would happen. It was not a question of superior dogmas, it was a question of superior buns. As a matter of fact, it was all a question of bribery and corruption in those cases. The noble Lord talked as if all those children were thirsting for Church dogma. They were simply ravenously greedy for buns. It was a question of blankets with the parents. This was the sort of thing that would go on. It would create wrangles and bitterness. It might be said that these things were trivialities. It was a great mistake to suppose that theology exalted people above these trifles. Quite the reverse. Theology rather exaggerated them. There would be bitterness and wrangling and jealousies—one sect saying, "We are only getting Tuesday. Monday is the best day, and you give that to the Methodists." Another would say, "Look at the Congregationalists, they have had the best class-room. We Anglicans have only got that miserable little apartment round there." The noble Lord was very anxious to spread the spirit of religion. He could assure the noble Lord that strife was not the atmosphere in which religion prospered. This sort of strife and squabbling would go on with the facilities given for this, what might be called, lamb-stealing—one sect crossing the boundary and taking sheep from the flock of the other. He knew that the noble Lord wanted some sort of cattle-branding process whereby they would fix on the children these marks. Although the noble Lord believed in Canon Moberly and his doctrines, these things did not divide the children. He had read Canon Moberly religiously, and he gave the noble Lord Dr. Clifford. He ventured to say that the noble Lord had the better of the bargain. These things were so abstruse that although he had been trained at a Church school he did not understand them. The idea of reading all these abstruse things, all this mysticism, and that they should read Canon Moberly in an Oxfordshire rural school to a lot of children! They would not understand it. Children did not worry about these things. The noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University said they had perfect peace in the schools. Of course they had, and the children knew nothing about these theologies, and they cared less about them. Why on earth where they had peace should they introduce discord? They were proposing to bring these differences and these sects face to face. They would bring the children into physical conflict in some of those cases. There were some people who thought it was much more important to train children in some of the elementary ideas of the duties of citizenship. If they gave theological discourses, why should they not have political lectures? Why not bring them up in their views of politics? In a rural district they might have the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford taking the children into a classroom and discussing the virtues of pure beer. That was a dogma the right hon. Gentleman believed in much more profoundly than anything else. If they were going to have the dogmas of the parent, what right had any one to dictate the lines on which they were going to proceed in these matters? The only successful way was that which had been followed in all our colonies and in America with no harm to the theology or dogma. Let not the noble Lord forget that there was much more dogma, much more doctrine, in America than in this country, and that more people in proportion attended the churches there. Yet their dogmas were not taught in their schools. They taught there what were called the Christian virtues. The noble Lord did not seem to think that these were of much importance compared with Canon Moberly. After all, the Christian virtues were undenominational, and the most important of them, charity, was certainly undenominational. The noble Lord made use of a very curious expression. He said that the real life was in those things about which the denominations differed. What an extraordinary proposition! The Christian virtues were the tree with the bark stripped off, the branches lopped, and the leaves gone, and the true life, according to the noble Lord, was in those things which enabled a man to quarrel with his neighbour about them. What a notion of Christianity! All the rest was absolutely nothing. All he could say was that any other country but this could teach Christianity without introducing all these differences into the schools, and that was what we ought to do in this country. The noble Lord said that the children knew of these differences already, and could not cross a village green without seeing that there were churches and chapels. He could assure the noble Lord that he knew of villages where the children could cross the village green without seeing any chapel; where the chapel was put in the background, and there was no outward and visible evidence there, at any rate, of any of these differences. But there was a great distinction between the children seeing such evidence and bringing the differences into the schools with sectarian doctrine. What was wanted was to train the children as common citizens, not to give facilities for the introduction of these sectarian squabbles and wrangles into the schools, but to place every difficulty they could in the way of such introduction.

*(7.5.) MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said that he would like to ask the hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon who it was that was responsible for these religious squabbles and religious differences. It was not the supporters of the voluntary schools that were responsible for them. There was nothing about which they need squabble. Would the hon. Member say why it was alleged that there was a religious grievance? It was not they in the Church of England who wanted to raise religious difficulties.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if the right hon. Gentleman wished him to answer at once, he certainly would. The Church of England had 12,000 schools supported at the public expense, and 60,000 teachers exclusively appointed.

*MR. TALBOT said it was quite right that hon. Gentlemen opposite should throw off the mask, and show that what they wanted was to eliminate all the voluntary schools in the country, and establish universal board schools. This was now the avowed policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite, although they had, for a long time, refrained from coming to close quarters, and professed their willingness to do justice to the voluntary schools. By this Clause his noble friend did not create all this religious controversy. He and those who agreed with him had tried to meet the Nonconformist grievance by offering to give facilities which they thought would satisfy the Nonconformist conscience. The supporters of the Amendment had derived a very considerable accession of strength that afternoon from the very remarkable speech delivered by the Leader of the House, who had disclosed the workings of his mind and had told them how he had come to his present condition of mind as to the effect of his noble friend's Amendment. The Prime Minister had said that if he were free to do what he liked, he would support the Clause moved by his noble friend, but that he did not think the Clause would work in practice. But all that they asked was to give them a chance to try whether it was workable or not. He believed that if the Clause were put in operation the anticipated friction prophesied would not arise. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, in the course of his speech had used language which had lifted them into a high and pure atmosphere, and that right hon. Gentleman, he believed, was in favour of the principles he and his friends were advocating, though he would not avow it. The right hon. Gentleman said that he could not see how the Clause of his noble friend could be practically worked. It had been practically worked in Ireland and in Scotland and why should a system which worked well in Ireland and in Scotland not work in England if fairly tried. He had heard of a case in the Western Highlands of Scotland where the inhabitants were partly Roman Catholic, and partly Presbyterian. The children in the school were divided into two separate divisions—the Roman Catholics going to one side of the school, and the Presbyterians going to the other side of the school, where each got their own particular religious instruction. No friction occurred, and the religious difficulty was solved.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he imagined it was the general wish of the House that they should not delay long in coming to a conclusion on this matter. He had only one or two observations to make in regard to the merits of the Clause itself. He was content to accept as the expression of his own opinion the most admirable speech of his right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen at the beginning of the debate; but there were one or two things he wanted to point out. In the first place, the noble Lord, the author of this Clause, talked in a feeling way, and with great effect, of a double injustice, and had the idea that the one injustice could be set off against the other injustice—the injustice of the Nonconformist, or other man, outside the Church of England, who, in certain parishes, found that his child must be instructed in a faith not his own, while, on the other hand, there was a corresponding injustice inflicted upon the Church parent having his children in the school under the dominion of the School Board. There the noble Lord made the mistake, which was a very common mistake, of assuming that the School Boards were necessarily Nonconformist. As a matter of fact, that was not so. In the only part of England with regard to which he had seen an analysis of the membership of the School Boards there was a majority of three to two of Anglican members over all the other members of the School Boards. There was this further matter of fact, that in the majority of School Boards in the large towns, the Chairman was a bishop, or a canon, or some other dignitary of the Established Church. It must be remembered that these clergymen might or might not be placed on the Board by the operation of the cumulative vote; but the significant point was that, after being made members of the Board, they were elected to the Chairmanship by their fellow members. It was, in these circumstances, ridiculous to talk of a Nonconformist religion being foisted on the Church children by the School Boards. Yet, that was the common talk among the supporters of the Bill, and the common view taken by a large number of people in the country, even if the noble Lord himself did not use language so strong. There was no foundation for it whatever. He believed that that neutral representation of the fundamental principle and doctrines of Christianity, which might be called the religion taught in the School Board schools, was eminently representative, at any rate, of the Protestant feeling of the people of this country, and therefore could not be antagonistic to the Established Church, because if the Established Church was not a Protestant Church it was time that the people of this country knew it. That was the first point that he wished to make against the argument of the noble Lord. Then it was said with regard to the alleged fair and equitable arrangement between the two parties in this matter, that, while the Anglican clergy would have access to the School Board schools, in order to see that their doctrines were duly taught to their own flock, the Nonconformists would have equal access to the denominational schools in the country parishes. The two cases were not on the same footing. In the one case there was a Church which was rich and great in influence and with any amount of staff—clergy and others—on whom it could draw to undertake this duty in all the schools. What provision was there in the country villages for the teaching of the different classes of religious opinion which might be found represented among the children of these schools? There was no equality at all in the matter. On that ground the provision seemed to him to be objectionable as it stood. But it seemed to him that the merits of the Clause were almost overshadowed by the extraordinary character of the position in which the House of Commons was invited to discuss this question. It must be borne in mind that the House was discussing this matter under the immediate prospect of the guillotine. This day was allotted for the discussion of all the new Clauses and of all the Amendments upon the first four Clauses of the Bill, and the greater part of the time was to be occupied in discussing a Clause that had been on the Paper for weeks, as to which everybody's mind must have been made up; yet the mind of the Government was not made up. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Government had taken a course which he believed had never been taken by any one in the right hon. Gentleman's position before. Here was a most important Clause, which he said would be impracticable, and which might therefore cause mischief to the working of the educational system, and he stated that he approved of it in theory, but disapproved of it in practice, and that he would not vote either one way or the other. The House was to be left without his guidance—or, rather, with this double guidance—to find its way in this complicated, most vital, and most important matter. The right hon. Gentleman had conducted the discussion of the Clauses of this Bill in all its stages in a way to attract the sympathy, respect, and admiration of all who had attended the debates. But when it came to this important point, and there were other Clauses and Amendments which greatly demanded the consideration of the House, and which would not be reached because hour after hour was occupied in this discussion, the right hon. Gentleman had not had the courage to do what his words would lead the House to believe he ought to do—namely, to oppose the Clause. If he had done so, a division might have been taken two or three hours ago, and all this time might have been saved. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if this Clause were introduced into the Bill he could not be responsible for the Bill. At any rate, whatever the other words were, he used the phrase that he could not be responsible for the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I said I could not be responsible for introducing it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the right hon. Gentleman was responsible whether he liked it or not. It might be open to any individual Member to say he would not be responsible for introducing this Clause, and therefore he would not vote; but the right hon. Gentleman was in charge of the Bill. He trusted that the House would reject the Clause, because he felt certain that the good object with which it had been introduced would not be accomplished, and that it would do a great deal of harm to the education and even to the religious interests of the country.

(7.21) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 57 ; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 576.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Baldwin, Alfred
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles,T. Gibson(King's Lynn
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane,Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cranborne, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Fergusson,Rt.Hn SirJ(Manc'r
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,SirRobert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Ernest
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H(City ofLond.
Gibbs,Hon. Vicary(St. Albans)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grenfell, William Henry
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J. Scott (Hants.
Morrison, James Archibald
Myers, William Henry
Nolan,Col.John P. (Galway,N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Rankin, Sir James
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,SirCharles G. E.(Notts.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Hugh Cecil and Mr. Talbot.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Capt.SirAlex.F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allan, SirWilliam (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Anstruther, H. T.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot,Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW(Leeds
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Chamberlain,RtHn.J A(Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb.SirJohn CharlesReady
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,SirHoratio D(Chatham
Dewar,John A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,RtHon.SirWilliamHart
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gladstone,RtHn. HerbertJohn
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch,ErnestFrederickGeorge
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill,Rt.Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somerset,E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawrence,WilliamF(Liverpool
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lockie, John
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil

Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pilkington, Lieut. Col. Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Rigg, Richard
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, Brooke
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Webb, Colonel William George
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Colonel Sandys and Mr. Middlemore.

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, further proceedings on consideration, as amended, stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

(9.0.) MR. BRYCE moved the adoption of a new Clause to remedy the inconveniences, confusion, and occasion for friction, which he was satisfied would be found to arise from the system of dual control of voluntary school buildings set up by the Bill. They were now attempting to create what had been called a national system of education, and surely one of its characteristics ought to be a certain measure of uniformity. He would suggest that one of the best ways of removing the inconveniences of dual control would be to bring the school buildings under the control of the local authority, to transfer them from the managers or trustees, and to put them equally with the provided schools under the control of the loca authority. This might properly be done by the application to the case of section 23 of the Act of 1870. Let him say a word or two about the schools to which it was proposed to apply that section. They had got too much in the habit of talking about them as if they were the property of a denomination—of the Church of England or of the Wesleyans. But they were not in any sense the property of a denomination. They were schools held under certain trust deeds and incapable of being used except for the objects of the trust. The trusts were educational, and primarily for the education of the poor; in some cases, but not in all, they were for the education of children in the tenets of a particular denomination. A crisis had arisen in the history of these schools. They could no longer continue under the old system. During the last few years they had more and more complained of the difficulty of supporting themselves; the managers had said it was impossible to get sufficient subscriptions to keep the school efficient and had applied to the Government for aid. The Government under this Bill had come to their assistance and proposed to maintain the schools out of the rates, while leaving the liability for repairs on the shoulders of the managers or trustees, or owners of the buildings. Under this proposal the local authority would become the owners of the schools either in fee simple or as lessee, would undertake the whole cost of repairs as well as maintenance, and would carry out the trusts, as far as might be, consistently with the changed circumstances of the time. That was to say, the local authority would carry out the primary object of the trust, that of providing elementary instruction, and would also provide for religious instruction by securing that the trustees or managers should be entitled to have religious instruction at such times as would not interfere with the ordinary secular instruction. The question arose on what terms the transfer should be made. Strictly speaking, looking at it as a question of law, it would appear that no Clause could be founded to have any payment made for the use of the schools, because after all they were charity schools held upon trust, which the State had a perfect right to vary. Suppose the schools were sold, no person had a right to appropriate the money. The trustees could not put it into their pocket. If, therefore, the schools were devoted to purposes of elementary education, no claim could arise in respect of them. It was necessary, however, to make a general arrangement. Acting under the Act of 1870, the Committee of Council laid down the principle that nothing should be given to trustees whose schools were taken over by the School Board, the only consideration to be the maintenance of the school; in fine, it was to be a gratuitous transfer. If, therefore, they were now to provide that these schools should be taken over at a nominal rent, they would be doing no more than was contemplated by the Act of 1870. His proposal was that the transfer should be made upon such terms regarding rent or purchase-money as may be agreed between the trustees and the local education authority, or, in default of agreement, fixed by the Board of Education, regard being had to the purposes for which, under the trust deed, the buildings may be used, to the sources whence the sums expended on the buildings were derived, and to the rights of user reserved to the trustees. That appeared to him to be a reasonable compromise. The question followed, upon what basis the value of these school buildings should be estimated? Some very exaggerated and absurd estimates had been made of their total value; he had known it estimated as high as £40,000,000 or £50,000,000. He thought his hon. friend the Member for Wigan, however, estimated it at about £15,000,000.

* SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): More than that.

MR. BRYCE: If they made the various deductions which ought in reason and equity to be made from any estimate of the capital value of these schools, he thought less than half of £15,000,000 would probably fairly represent their value. They would have to deduct the schools not under trust, the property of private owners, which were not covered by this Amendment. They would find, too, a large number of schools which had been erected to a great extent out of building grants from the National Exchequer, and on land which had been given without any denominational condition. There was a large number of these schools which were undenominational; and, in addition, he believed a great many of the schools would be handed over by the denomination. They must consider, too, that the buildings were not saleable, partly on account of the trust, and partly because they were not fitted for other uses. Putting all these things together, he believed the value would be reduced to a figure which would not impose any very heavy tax on the resources of the local authority. He therefore suggested that the proper course for them to take would be to empower the local authority to purchase or lease these schools—he did not think the power should be made in the first instance compulsory; and that if the parties could not agree on terms the value should be settled by the Board of Education. What was their desire was that the control of all buildings should be in the hands of the local authority, and that there should be the same kind of jurisdiction for all schools. Although this scheme no doubt departed from that hitherto advocated by the Government, it would have the greatest possible advantage of being uniform and simple.

New Clause :—

"The managers or trustees of any school which by its trust deed is to be used for the purposes of instruction as an elementary school shall at the request of the local education authority transfer the school buildings to that authority either by way of lease for a term of years renewable for ever or absolutely, pursuant to section twenty-three of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, upon such terms regarding rent or purchase-money as may be agreed between the trustees and the local education authority, or, in default of agreement, fixed by the Board of Education, regard being had to the purposes for which under the trust deed the buildings may be used, to the sources whence the sums expended on the buildings were derived, and to the rights of user reserved to the trustees. Provided that such managers or trustees may reserve out of such transfer to trustees, to be nominated by them for that purpose, the use of the school buildings when the same are not being used for school purposes, and may provide for the giving of any religious instruction, over and above that which may be given by the teachers, either before the opening or after the close, or both before the opening and after the close, of the ordinary school hours, under the direction either of the last hereinbefore mentioned trustees, or of such person or persons as the last hereinbefore mentioned trustees may from time to time appoint."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he had listened to the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman with a good deal of surprise. If he had not known the right hon. Gentleman to be an eminent constitutional lawyer he should have termed his proposals revolutionary, and to a certain extent predatory, and they would involve such an entire change in the policy of the Government that it could hardly be expected that they would for a moment be entertained. The right hon. Gentleman began with a kindly consideration of the difficulties under which voluntary schools would labour when the local authority had a very large user of the building, and he was so kind as to suggest that the difficulties in regard to the school buildings might be solved by a happy and rapid process of extinction of the voluntary schools. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of cases in which land had been given for purposes of the construction of a school without any denominational condition, although by long practice the school was denominational, and such schools he proposed to hand over to the education authority without inquiry into the intentions of the original donor. Then he proposed a process of expropriation to which the owners of the property were to have no alternative. He founded himself on Clause 23 of the Act of 1870, but did not dwell on the important fact that the provisions of that Clause were optional. That was a very different thing from a compulsory process of expropriation in which the persons having the legal ownership of the land had no choice, and under which the local education authority was to be empowered, at its own request, to take the land whether the owner would or no. It was a very different thing to take land without an option at a price to be ascertained and to allow land with liabilities upon it to be handed over at the request of the persons interested. The Board of Education might thus fairly say, "If you choose to get rid of your liabilities in this way there shall be a nominal price or the rent shall be a peppercorn rent." But assuming, as the right hon. Gentleman did assume, that in these cases a substantial rent or a substantial price would be demanded, what was the process? Surely under such circumstances there would be a reference to some form of legal inquiry, so that the authorities might be satisfied that their claims had been assessed by a tribunal used to dealing with such matters. The provisions of the Lands Clauses Act with a reference to arbitration or to a sheriff's jury would be the proper course for such a procedure as the right hon. Gentleman had suggested. Under other circumstances questions of a similar kind to this had been referred to the proper machinery under the Lands Clauses Act with a sheriff's jury, or a court of arbitration. There was to be a reservation to the trustees to nominate other persons under whose supervision religious instruction, in accordance with the terms of the trust, or the practice and principles under which the trust had been administered, was to be given out of school hours. That surely was a very poor representation of the terms of the trust or the practice and principles of the school as they had been conducted in the past, and under which religious teaching had been given as a part of the children's education. He held the strongest opinion that religious instruction, if it was to be of real value to the child, should not be given by a separate instructor and at a separate time, but should really be a substantial part of the education of the child. He asked the House whether it was not a complete departure from the principles upon which this matter had been conducted, that these schools should be taken away from the ownership under which they had hitherto existed, and placed under the local education authority under which the religious instruction hitherto given as part of the school daily course would be given by a separate instructor at different times? He did not think this could be considered as any sort of equivalent for the system under which the schools had existed down to the time of this compulsory appropriation. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was not merely a serious invasion of the rights of property, conducted under the semblance of a kindly consideration for the difficulties of trustees. It was also an absolute reversal of the policy of the Bill, an entire departure from the intention of the Bill to preserve denominational schools where they were capable of supporting themselves and maintaining their independent existence and the instruction which they had given to the satisfaction and advantage of the area in which they were situated. He hoped, therefore, the House would not delay long in expressing its opinion that the new Clause could not be accepted.

(9.35) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he desired to say a few words in support of the Amendment proposed by his right hon. friend. He did so partly because it contained the principles of a Resolution which was agreed to unanimously by the City Council of Norwich, which was composed of a majority of the supporters of the Church of England, and in which they declared that a solution of the religious difficulty was to be found by the authority hiring and taking possession of the various schools known as denominational schools. The hon. Baronet who had just addressed the House said that this proposition would be revolutionary, but a proposal which had received such support could not be regarded in that light, and particularly in view of a letter which had been written by one of the most trusted and honoured Churchmen of Norwich—Archdeacon Sidney Pelham. In that letter reference was made to the fact that the question was forcing itself upon many Churchmen whether the time had not come when the Church of England might safely surrender her schools to the strong and sympathetic influence of religious people. It was also pointed out that as the denominational schools were depending more and more upon the taxes, and quickly becoming the schools of the nation, that they should be dealt with in a way similar to that proposed by this Clause. They heard these schools described too often as "our schools." When it was remembered what large sums of public money were paid for their support, it was, in his opinion, an entirely unwarrantable claim to speak of them in this manner. Some of these schools were used for an entirely opposite purpose to that for which the grants were given them. There were some in Norwich which were used as parish rooms and Sunday schools, and in no sense used as elementary schools. It should be emphasised that these schools were not the private property of one denomination. They received large grants of public money to carry on certain duties, and if they failed to perform them they should either transfer them, so that they could be used for the purpose for which the grants were made, or the money should be refunded to the public authority. He believed it was true that the Free Church of Scotland transferred the whole of their schools to the public authority without any payment.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): Because the religion was to be maintained.

MR. GEORGE WHITE said Members on the Opposition side were quite as anxious for religious teaching as hon. Members opposite. As the Council of Norwich said in their resolution, there should be simple Bible teaching, with the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, and for special denominational purposes facilities should be given as described in this Clause. The value of a large number of the schools in Norfolk had been greatly overrated. Many of the schools were old, and would have to be dealt with in a very drastic way if they were to be used for the educational requirements of the day. In Norfolk more than £30,000 of public money had been granted towards the building of these schools. When they were taken over from the private owner their capital value would be much smaller than the general estimates offered to this House and to the country. He warmly supported this proposition.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL reminded the House that there were such persons in the world as private owners. Many of these schools had been conveyed under the Schools Sites Act, with the proviso that in the event of the land ceasing to be used for the purposes mentioned it should revert to the owners whence it came. Clearly a provision such as the Clause contained would amount to absolute confiscation. He knew a case where a site was conveyed under the Schools Sites Act, but as it became totally unsuited for the purposes of education owing to a change in the population, it reverted to the owner. If this proposal had been in force that site would have been lost to the owner. In this instance the site was valued, and the owner gave to a new school the full value of that site. Still the owner was entitled to that site, seeing that it had ceased to be used for the purposes of a school. He contended that to take away that site from the owner would have been absolute, direct, and complete confiscation. He did not think that he need dwell upon the arguments of previous speakers, but he would point out that here was the greatest difference between the Section of the Act of 1870 and the Clause moved by his right hon. friend. Some of them thought the Act of 1870 was very harsh, and many schools had been transferred in a panic which, if more time had been granted, would never have been transferred at all. The friends of voluntary schools had to deal with the facts of the case, and he thought they had done their best under difficult circumstances.. They must remember that their Roman Catholic brethren had never transferred one single school, and had shown in this respect an example to Protestants which they would have done well to have followed more closely. In the case of the Act of 1870, the consent of the managers was required, but in addition there was a power given of prohibition upon alienation except by the consent of other outside persons. When the National Society made their grants they imposed a condition that their consent would be required for the transfer. In cases where the old school was in a bad condition, the National Society had given their consent; but in many cases, by withholding their consent, in the course of a year or two a more wholesome condition of opinion had arisen, and schools had been saved. Under this proposal all those schools would be doomed. In the Act of 1870, as regarded voluntary schools, they had found that the principle of partial transfers had entirely failed, and they had already ceased to sanction transfers under those conditions. The reason was that if they transferred the schools for certain hours only they had found so much friction and inconvenience that the working of that scheme was absolutely impossible. They had been taught by experience that this partial transfer during certain hours of the day and for certain purposes did not answer in practice and had caused great disappointment and could not, in justice to voluntary schools, become a part of the national system of this country.

*MR. YOXALL said that in and about 1871 a great number of these transfers took place, and he thought they took place beneficially for the national interest. The National Society since then had done its best to prevent these transfers and they had now been told by the hon. Baronet opposite that the National Society meant to pursue that policy to the end and adopt the same course with regard to transfers arising out of this Bill. He wished to point out to the hon. Baronet nd to the First Lord of the Treasury that perhaps a proposal of the kind made by his right hon. friend might be advisable as a safety valve for use when this Bil became an Act of Parliament and came into operation. Many localities would regard this Act with great suspicion and would be inclined to use the legal rights which they possessed both within and outside the limits of this Act to the utmost. One of their rights would be, in the case of a quarrel between the managers and themselves to refuse to deal with the managers in the way the managers might desire. The hon. Baronet opposite had referred to the Schools Sites Act. There were hundreds of cases in the country where, if the question was looked into by a court of law, it would be found that buildings originally erected by a trust, to which contributions had been made in the way of building grants by the Board of Education, were now in the possession of a denomination, and were not being used for day school purposes at all. The House might depend upon it that these local authorities, through their municipal and legal advisers, would take steps to discover what was the legal position of these schools, and in the event of a quarrel, and if it became impossible to carry on the school, then this question of the legal ownership of the building and the reversion of the site under the Schools Sites Act would be gone into and would be considered in a very awkward way. Therefore it appeared to him that the proposal would be a valuable provision in the working of the Bill as a safety valve against that kind of thing. In many cases the buildings would cease to be used as a school because of a quarrel between the local authority and the trustees, and it would be wise to insert a provision to relieve the difficulty which would arise. In the Act of 1870 it was laid down that schools could be leased at a nominal rent or otherwise. For some reason, the Board of Education in 1871 laid down by Minute that only a nominal rent was to be paid. His right hon. friend now proposed to allow more than a nominal rent to be paid, so that the trustees might in that way obtain funds for the maintenance of the fabric and the upkeep of the building. Unless some such provision was made, either in the Bill or by Minute of the Board of Education, in case of difficulty or quarrel there would be no alternative but to call in the School Sites Act, and the operation of the provisions under which building grants weregiven. The trustees might find themselves unable to carry on the schools as voluntary schools, having lost their Parliamentary grant, unable to carry on the schools with the assistance of the local authority because of a quarrel between the local authority and the trustees, unable to sell their building because of the lien which the State had upon them in respect of the building grant, and yet unable to give over the site of the building to the original donor under the School Sites Act. The hon. Baronet, the Secretary to the Board of Education, would do well to consider the propriety of issuing a new Minute with regard to the rents for such schools.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education appeared to be labouring under considerable misapprehension. He had spoken about compulsory expropriation, and had used other expressions indicating the opinion that the trustees of this property were the owners. The trustees were not the owners; and therefore the word "expropriation" was altogether inappropriate when the beneficial ownership remained in the same persons as before. The beneficial owners were the persons on whose behalf the trust had to be exercised, and the trustees were merely the nominal owners in whom the lega lestate was vested for purposes which were of no benefit to them, but were a labour and obligation upon them. The duties of the trustees were now to be shifted on to other shoulders, and it was right and proper that the machinery given to them to perform those duties should be handed over also. He quite recognised that there might be subsidiary trusts on which the property was held to a certain extent. The trustees might have the use of the buildings for Sunday School and evening services, but the Clause was so framed as to safeguard such cases. The House ought to face the situation boldly, and say that, so far as the buildings were impressed with a trust for public education, they should be transferred to the body in whose hands Parliament had placed the duty of administering public education.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Amendment was an important one, and he should support it as a possible alternative to the Government's proposal. The Secretary to the Board of Education had described the Amendment as "predatory," but how could that be when a rent was offered for the building? It was altogether a question of the amount of rent. The trustees were surrendering the functions for which they were created as a trust, and if they were surrendering their liabilities, was it too much to say that they must also surrender their assets? But his right hon. friend did not go as far as that. Where was the robbery in taking over a trust in which the balance was on the wrong side? Robbery came in when you deprived a man of his property for your own benefit. Here there was no benefit except that of the public; from the financial point of view it would be a burden on the locality. According to the Bishop of London the rent value of these properties was £750,000. He believed that to be a grossly exaggerated estimate, but for the purposes of argument he would accept it. The exclusive use of the buildings for religious purposes on Sundays and week evenings was surely worth £250,000. That left £500,000 which might be charged against the State, although, when it was remembered that these were purely educational trusts, it was not right to so charge the whole of that sum. However, the Government, under this Bill, were giving by way of a grant in aid £1,200,000, less than one half of which would have settled the whole problem and nationalised all the schools, without depriving any body of trustees of their rights in the property. It was a grave misfortune the Government had not faced that problem. The Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich demonstrated that in his view, the religious difficulty would be met in more than half the parishes in the Kingdom by the granting of facilities for teaching the dogmas of the particular sections in the National schools. That condition would be met by the proposal of his right hon. friend, and no one would contend that education would not be better served by the complete control being vested in one body rather than in two bodies which were hostile upon several points.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) expressed his regret that the proposal had not been brought forward in a voluntary rather than a compulsory form and that opportunity had not been given to the House to consider proposals of a more moderate character. If certain proposals to facilitate the voluntary leasing of schools under certain conditions had been brought to discussion, the Government might have seen their way to amend Section 23 of the Act of 1870, which certainly did not give the facilities for transfer desired in certain places. Owing to the action of the Board of Education and the National Society that Section for many years had a very limited operation. If a freer hand had been given to managers and fewer consents required, he believed they might have achieved the end desired by many people, viz., the stamping of schools with a public character, and at the same time securing the denominational teachers.

(10.12.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 102; Noes, 196. (Division List No. 577.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings

Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Cann, James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow

Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,HonM.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.HnSirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.ACE(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*(10.25.) MR. CHANNING said that the effect of the new Clause which stood in his name was to practically restore to the local authority the option which had been removed by the striking out of Clause 5. It would enable the County Council and County Borough Council to continue the School Board as the education authority. He had not placed this new Clause upon the Paper with a view to rendering a mere barren testimony to the virtues of School Boards. He felt certain that they would come back after the passing of this Bill before long to something like the old *ad hoc* machinery. He did not believe that the people of this country would for long consent to leave education in the hands of a non-representative cabin-window committee, largely of officials and interested persons, and to put up for any length of time with a system that did not directly represent the people in educational matters. The only objections he had heard against the School Board system were those with which they were so familiar and which had been urged by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. He had always regarded those as cap-and-bell arguments. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had spoken of School Boards as exciting no interest, but he could not have taken part in School Board work or a School Board election or he would never have used such an argument. The right hon. Gentleman had attempted to make a case against the School Boards by quoting the instances of a handful of School Boards in tiny villages containing somewhat backward and sleepy communities, where perhaps a few thousand children had been submitted to a parsimonious régime. Because a few village schools like that had been starved by cheese-paring farmers they were calmly asked to set aside the democratic School Boards of the great towns representing populations by the hundred-thousand, the instruments which had rescued the people by the million from the ignorance and absolute barbarism of thirty years ago. That was the argument, and it was an insult to the intelligence of the country and of this House to thus invite them to sweep away the machinery which had worked, and was working, such splendid results. They had been taunted with the argument that there was no demand for the retention of the School Board system. At the North Leeds election the wonderful victory which was won there was almost entirely fought out on this one question of the absolute incompetence of the Town Council of Leeds to deal with education, while the democratic School Board of Leeds had produced the most magnificent educational results. He quite recognised the duty of providing a complete alternative scheme to that of the Bill, and had placed other Clauses on the Paper for the creation of district School Boards and a central court authority for controlling all branches of education, so as to give effect to the scheme laid before the country by Lord Spencer. He begged to move the new Clause standing in his name.

New Clause—

"The Council of a county or county borough, or of any borough with a population of over ten thousand, or of any urban district with a population of over twenty thousand, may, after such notices and under such regulations as the Board of Education shall prescribe, determine by resolution that any existing School Board within the county, or the existing School Board in any county borough, or in any borough with a population of over ten thousand, or urban district with a population of over twenty thousand, as the case may be, shall be the local education authority for the purposes of Part III. of this Act within the area for which such School Board has been formed, and thereupon such School Board shall have throughout their area, in respect of Part III. of this Act, all the powers and duties of a local education authority under this Act as hereinafter provided."—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that this proposal involved an entire reversal of the policy of the Bill. He did not know whether he was right or not, but he thought he heard the hon. Member say that the Town Council of Leeds was absolutely incompetent to deal with education. He could hardly think that the hon. Member was serious in that statement. Personally, he believed that the Town Council of Leeds was most competent for that work. He believed, also, that all the best elements of the present School Board in Leeds would be placed at the service of the new authority under this Bill, and either as members of the Town Council or the Education Committee, those people, who in Leeds had done such noble educational work, would put their services at the disposal of the community as in the past. This new Clause involved the sacrifice of that principle which was an essential feature of this Bill, namely, the co-ordination of all education, both secondary and elementary. He hoped the House was not prepared to abandon principles which had been so thoroughly established in their previous debates, and he trusted the House would reject this proposal.

DR. MACNAMARA said that he had no doubt that the time would come when the Government would have to go back on the present policy. There was a great deal to be said for making great School Boards the authority for all forms of education. He remembered that in the year 1899 the late Vice President of the Council spoke in terms of eulogy of the work of our great School Boards. It would be a most unfortunate thing if the work of the School Boards in our great cities and towns was in any way hampered or interfered with by this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, speaking at Bradford on 11th January, 1899, stated that there was a great deal to be said for making the large School Boards the education authority for all forms of education. He felt confident that the time would come when the right hon. Gentleman would have ample proof that by this statement he had made a perfectly correct prophecy. He had no doubt himself that the *personnel* of the Leeds Town Council was as good as the Leeds School Board, but he felt that by handing over this great educational work to a committee, or to another body which was subject to any other authority, the work would break down from physical reasons, and the time would come when they would have to go back upon the policy of this Bill, and re-establish the *ad hoc* form of local government for educational purposes. In Leeds they had an enormous expenditure of about half a million of money upon education. They had a great many school departments, and tens of thousands of children, and thousands of teachers connected with elementary education, and besides this there was also in Leeds the higher and technical education to be dealt with. Therefore, for any municipal council to take over that work meant placing upon them more work than they could do thoroughly. The result would be that in Leeds the educational work would immediately devolve upon a committee more or less non-representative in its character, and the consequence would be that the officials in all great towns in the future would be the persons charged with the administration of education. In such places as Leeds, Birmingham, Nottingham, Bolton, Manchester, and Liverpool, education would be, for the most part, in the hands of the officials, and he thought this would be the greatest educational leap in the dark which this country had ever taken. Without making any reflection upon the capacity of the Leeds Town Council, he had no hesitation in saying that this Government and its successor would find it necessary in the future to go back to the *ad hoc* principle. When the Government proposed to apply this Bill to London he should do his level best to show that London presented a case which could only be efficiently dealt with under the *ad hoc* principle. He hoped his hon. friend would press this proposal to a division. He had every confidence that the Government would before long regret that it had wiped out by this Bill the experience, the capacity and the public spirit of great public bodies like the large School Boards of this country, which, according to the late Vice President of the Council, had done such magnificent educational work.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that he did not desire to argue the point of the small School Boards, but he held very strong views in reference to the position of the great School Boards. He had to keep in mind the fact that they had been told that within a very few months the question of the London School Board would be dealt with on the lines of this Bill. What this Clause did was to give an option to the local authority created by this Bill if they found that they were incompetent to carry out the work, and instead of forcing this educational work upon them to destroy the good work which they were at present doing they would have the option of leaving the educational part of their work in the hands of the authority which up to now had carried on the work in such an admirable way. That was no reflection whatever upon the local authority, whether such authority was the County Council or the Borough Council. They could rely upon it that the local education authority would not leave this question in the hands of the School Board unless they were not able to carry out the work themselves. This Bill threw the educational work on the local education authority whether it broke down or not, and the result would be as was stated by the hon. Member for North Camberwell that the work of education would be placed in the hands of the officials. That was the position which the Government had been forced to accept, and the House must remember that the one authority promised upon the introduction of the Bill had now entirely disappeared. He was sorry that the argument of the one authority had "taken in" one or two of his hon. friends on the Opposition side of the House, but he thought they were now beginning to see their mistake. The only point they had now to consider was what was the best way in which this educational work could be carried on. The Attorney General had stated that the work could be delegated to Committees, but surely it was better to allow the local authority the option of permitting the present educational body to carry on the work than to create a new non-representative Committee which might be incompetent to carry on educational work. He confessed that he felt that there was enormous force in the proposal made by his hon. friend, and if it were carried he thought it would help enormously the efficient working of this Bill.

(10.43.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 578.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Channing and Mr. George White.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A G H (City of London
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(10.55.) Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster), in moving the Clause standing in his name, said that in the few minutes remaining he could only point out that the adoption of this Clause would reduce to a minimum the objection held by many to sectarian teaching in elementary schools. No settlement could be come to except by consent, and he thought they had a right to ask, especially in the 8,000 parishes where there was only one school, that the religious instruction should be given in such a form as to be generally acceptable to the members of the different Churches. As the Bible was the common ground of Christianity, accepted by all the Protestant Churches as the basis of their teaching, catechetical or otherwise, he ventured to suggest that by the arrangement proposed to devote the first hour of the day on four days a week to general biblical instruction they would be meeting the wishes of those Nonconformist parents who desired that religious instruction should be given to their children but objected to have to withdraw them under the provisions of the Conscience Clause. By giving the catechism lesson during the last half-hour of the school meeting, those children might be allowed to go whose parents did not wish them to remain. He, therefore, urged the Government to accept this Clause, as affording a means of meeting the difficulty. He knew cases in which the proposed arrangement had worked remarkably well.

New Clause :—

"It shall be a condition of every public elementary school not provided by a local educational authority that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school, except during the last half-hour of the school meeting, and then only to those children whose parents have expressed in writing to the managers of the school a desire that such catechism or formulary shall be taught to their children.

"Provided that no bye-law shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parents belong."—(*Mr. Helme*).

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

(10.58.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 106 ; Noes, 210. (Division List No. 579.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Evans. Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth. R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.

Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Helme and Mr. Duncan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Iver Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to Parts I. and II. of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to insert, as a new sub-Section, the words, '(2) A Council, in exercising their powers under this Part of the Act, shall have regard to any existing supply of efficient schools or colleges, and any steps already taken for the purposes of higher education under the Technical Instruction Acts, 1889 and 1891.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.12.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 108. (Division List No 580.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. H. A. G. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molynenx
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Colonel William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)

Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out the words 'or college,' and insert the words 'college or hostel' instead thereof."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question, "That the words 'or college' stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

(11.24.) Question put, "That the words 'college or hostel' be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 213; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 581.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dewar, Sir T. R (Tower Hamlets
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Som'rs't, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate. Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.ACE.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,RtHon.E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glam'rgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Trevelyan.

*MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, Otley) said he desired to move the omission of Clause 5. He was a member of a deputation which waited on the chief officials of the Education Department in order to impress on them the desirability of not introducing into their Bill a proposal to deal with primary education. That was before Party feeling had been aroused; and they then thought that the great necessity was not to interfere with primary education, but to provide a system of secondary education. It had been stated more than once, throughout the debates on the Bill, that the object of the Government was to co-ordinate and unify education; and he felt that, in order to co-ordinate education, it would be necessary first to create a proper system of secondary education. It was quite true that the County Councils had administered technical education very well; but a proper system of secondary education, which was the connecting link between primary and technical education, had not yet been created. A great deal had been said about the difficulty of dealing with primary education in large county boroughs, but he did not think that that difficulty was comparable to the difficulty which would arise in a large county with a great number of schools scattered over many square miles. In the West Riding of Yorkshire there were 850 schools, employing 5,200 teachers, scattered over between 2,000 and 3,000 square miles. It was said that County Councils were too ambitious; that, in American parlance, "they had bitten off more than they could chew;" but in this case it must be noted that it was the intention of the Government to thrust on County Councils work which they felt themselves not at present capable of dealing with. The Councils which objected to having this work put upon them were in many cases Councils which had set an example to others by the manner in which they had managed the education entrusted to them. It was not because the Councils did not take a direct interest in all branches of education that they objected to primary education being put upon them. It was because they felt that the work should be done thoroughly, and because they desired to put into that work all the skill and experience they had had in other branches of educational work. Reference had been made during the debate to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the late Vice-President of the Council at Bradford in 1899. He had had the pleasure of listening to that speech; and if he had any objection to it at the time it was that the right hon. Gentleman put upon the School Boards the necessity for dealing with all branches of education. Those who had had experience of educational work in the County Councils believed that technical educational work had been well done; but not in the proposal that all branches of education should be put into their hands. It would be more advisable if the large councils, whether borough, municipal, or county, should have the opportunity of retaining the School Boards, which in the past had done such excellent work, in order to carry on, for a time at any rate, the work of primary education. The School Boards in the North of England were elected for educational purposes; and the people had not lost faith in them, or in the way in which they had carried on their work. Believing that it was desirable that for a time at least the larger School Boards, and some of the smaller ones, should be retained for the work which he was sure they would discharge as faithfully in the future as they had in the past, he moved the omission of the Clause.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 5."—(*Mr. Duncan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the Clause, to the word 'secular,' in page 3, line 2, stand part of the Bill."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he did not propose to reply at any length to the speech of the hon. Member. The omission of the Clause would go to the very root of the policy of the Bill; and to discuss it now would be to revive a discussion which was carried on at considerable length some months ago. He would only say that it was the belief of the Government that there would be great advantages in the counties and rural districts by establishing larger areas over which the local authority for elementary education would extend. To bring the education, in town and country under one co-ordinating authority would be of undoubted advantage to the community. He quite admitted that they would lose something in the dissolution of the larger School Boards, which, in towns, had done work which no one undervalued. But in every great change in which great advantages were contemplated, some loss must needs be incurred, which they all regretted, but the gains were not merely commensurate to the losses but outweighed them immeasurably.

(11.48) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 582.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, LordCharlesWilliam
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn.SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, HnA.G.H (City of Lond.
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, WJ H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, DavidJ. (Walth'mst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Col. Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinsen, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Byrn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'thants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Duncan and Mr. George White.

Further Consideration, as amended, adjourned till Tomorrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 26th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Buxton, against; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition from New Brompton, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEW SOUTH WALES (WOMEN'S FRANCHISE ACT, 1902).

Copy presented, of the Women's Franchise Act, 1902 (New South Wales) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 382.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2915 to 2917 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 585 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CASUALTIES TO STEAM BOILERS (MERCANTILE MARINE).

Return ordered, of casualties to steam boilers in the British Mercantile Marine during the five years ending the 31st day of December, 1901, in the following form:—

Name and type of boiler.	Estimated number of boilers in use.	Number of Casualties.	Number of persons killed.	Number of persons injured.	Remarks.
Fire tube - - - -					
Water tube (modern) -					
Water tube of the Haystack type - - -					

—*(Lord Charles Beresford.)*

CASUALTIES TO STEAM BOILERS (UNITED KINGDOM).

Return ordered, of casualties to steam boilers used on shore in the United Kingdom during the five years ending the 31st day of December, 1901, in the following form:—

Name and type of boiler.	Estimated number of boilers in use.	Number of casualties reported under the Boiler Explosions Act.	Number of persons killed.	Number of persons injured.	Remarks.
Types other than water tube - - - -					
Water tube - - -					

—*(Lord Charles Beresford.)*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Proposed Re-organisation of the Board of Trade.

MR. DAVID THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, when he is giving consideration to the position of the Board of Trade in relation to other Government Departments, and to the expediency of changing the name of its Head to that of Minister of Industry and Commerce, he will direct his attention towards the advisability of placing all functions more immediately relating to industry and commerce now exercised by other Departments in the charge of the Board of Trade, and of increasing its status and dignity rather than towards adding to its executive powers.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) If, and when, any change is contemplated in the composition of the Board of Trade, the suggestion contained in this Question will receive the fullest consideration.

Treaty of Upsala, 1654—Stamp Duties on British Insurance Policies in Sweden.

MR. GUTHRIE (Tower Hamlets, Bow): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the treaty entered into between Great Britain and Sweden, signed at Upsala on the 11th April (9th May) 1654, and renewed by Article II. of the Treaty of Orebro, 1812, wherein it is provided under Paragraph X. that British subjects shall, in matters of commerce, be placed in Sweden upon the same footing as Swedish subjects is still in force; and, if so, whether his attention has been called to the fact that a stamp duty is levied upon insurance policies of British insurance companies, while no stamp duty is payable by Swedish fire companies; and, if so, is he prepared to take steps to place the British offices operating in Sweden upon the same footing as their Swedish competitors.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The treaty of Upsala is still in force, but to which stipulation my hon. friend refers I do not understand. Article X. of the Treaty contains no such provision as he quotes, nor is any such stipulation in any other Article of that Treaty. There must be, I think, some misapprehension.

Central Telegraph Office—Operators' Grievances.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the fact that in October, 1900, the staff of the Cable Room, Central Telegraph Office, forwarded a petition to him dealing with inadequacy of pay, he can say if an answer can be given now.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) No answer has yet been given as, although it is clearly impossible to grant the general increase of pay asked for by the petitioners, some modification of the present arrangements in the Cable Room seems desirable, and the subject is therefore still under consideration.

Stafford Postal Staff—Allowances.

MR. CHARLES SHAW (Stafford): To ask the Postmaster General whether he has received a petition, dated early in April last, from the staff of the Stafford Post Office respecting the allowance of 3s. per trip paid to officers performing duties on the Tamworth and Hereford sorting carriage; and whether, in view of the fact that the present allowance is insufficient to cover their expenses, he can give them a favourable reply.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Yes, Sir; this petition has been brought to my notice, and I hope soon to be in a position to answer it.

Extension of Railways in Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

MR. HUDSON (Hertfordshire, Hitchin): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he can state if any, and, if so, which railways in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony are being extended at the present moment, and which lines it is proposed to extend in the near future.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Lines are in course of construction from Bloemfontein to Ficksburg and from Vereeniging to Johannesburg. Surveys are also being or have been made for lines from Harrismith to Vereeniging, from Sannah's Post to Wepener, from Springs to Machadodorp, and from Krugersdorp to Rustenburg, and other lines are under consideration as to which the information at present available is too incomplete to make it possible to arrive at a decision.

Importation of Dogs—Rabies.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether there have been any cases during the last five years in which rabies has been proved to have been introduced into this country by dogs imported from the Continent; and, if so, how many such cases have been established; and whether in any such cases the dogs have been purchased abroad, or have been dogs which have been taken away by their owners from this country and brought back under the regulations of the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) There have been two well-established cases of rabies in dogs imported from the Continent since the passing of the Importation of Dogs Order of 1897. In one case the dog was purchased abroad, and in the other it had been taken abroad by its owner and brought back with a licence for its landing. In both cases the disease was detected during the period of detention prescribed by the Board of Agriculture.

Cruelty to Children—Penruddocke Case—Suggested Alteration of Law.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the punishment imposed in the recent case of Rex *v.* Penruddocke; and whether he proposes to make any alteration in the penalties that can be inflicted in cases of cruelty to children.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The penalties that can be inflicted in the cases mentioned are prescribed by The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1894, and could only be altered by legislation. They are fixed with wide limits so as to allow, at the discretion of the court, a suitable penalty for every case. The penalties, on conviction on indictment, may be a fine of any amount up to £100, or a sentence of imprisonment for not more than two years, either as an alternative for, or in addition to a fine. The only alteration which would appear to be suggested is to the effect of prescribing a fixed or minimum penalty for all cases. Not only would this be sure to operate most unjustly in certain cases, but the principle of fixing minimum penalties is contrary to the whole tendency and practice of modern legislation.

Penruddocke Case—Suggested Removal of Mr. Penruddocke's Name from Roll of Magistrates.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the censure passed by the jury upon Mr. Penruddocke at a recent trial; and whether it is proposed to take steps to remove that gentleman's name from the roll of magistrates in the county of Wilts.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) After consulting the Lord Chancellor in the matter, my answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

Committee on Ventilation of Factories.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has considered the First Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the ventilation of factories and workshops; and what steps he proposes to take to carry out the recommendations made therein.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) This Report is receiving very careful consideration; and, as a preliminary to deciding what action shall be taken on it, I am having further trials made of the proposed new method of testing the atmosphere in factories.

Central London Railway—Vibration.

MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state when arrangements will be completed for stopping the annoyance and damage from vibration arising on the Central London Railway; and whether the Board of Trade will take steps to compel the adoption of the suggestions of their Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Company have recently informed me that, in view of the suggestions made by the Committee, they decided to substitute motor cars for the present locomotives; that tenders for the construction and equipment of the cars were let in May last, and that the contractors assure them that delivery of the cars will commence in the early part of next year.

Annual Leave and Free Passes Home for Men on Active Service.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of arranging that soldiers and sailors on active service may be allowed a free passage to their homes once a year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am afraid that there is no precedent for the grant of leave to soldiers to come home during active service, and operations in the field would necessarily suffer. Further, the cost of the passages would be quite prohibitive. As regards sailors, the question should be addressed to the Secretary to the Admiralty.

Woolwich Arsenal—Discharge of Workmen—Output of Small Arms Ammunition.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that workmen are being discharged from certain departments in Woolwich Arsenal at the rate of about 300 a week, while at the same time work is being done overtime in other Departments, and whether he will consider the advisability of so distributing the work as to obviate the working overtime in some Departments whilst hands are being discharged in others; whether he is aware that contractors are supplying the same amount per week of small arms ammunition as they supplied before the war, whilst the Royal Arsenal is supplying 50 per cent. less; and will he state whether any of the men now being discharged from the Royal Arsenal are reservists lately returned from South Africa; and, if so, how many.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The pressure due to the war having now relaxed, it is inevitable that some discharges should be made from the ordnance factories. Men have recently been discharged at the rate of 100 a week (not 300), and the total discharges for the last six months amount to about 800 men. Further discharges will have to be made at the end of the financial year. There is practically no overtime worked now, except such as is absolutely necessary in continuous operations, etc., and, owing to the different natures of operations, it is impossible to prevent discharges by any redistribution of work. The weekly output of small arms ammunition from the ordnance factories has been reduced to three-quarter million rounds a week, but it is not possible to interfere with orders already given to contractors. It is not known whether there are any reservists among the men discharged. Instructions will be given to avoid such discharges wherever possible. The policy of keeping a considerable reserve of power of output in the ordnance factories available in time of war has been deliberately adopted and will be adhered to.

Education Bill—Voluntary School Teachers.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, with reference to the Second Schedule of the Education (England and Wales) Bill, teachers in a voluntary school transferred, under the operation of the Bill, to the County Council will be treated in precisely the same way as teachers in a board school are to be treated when transferred; and whether, with reference to Clause 19 of the Second Schedule of the Bill, teachers in a voluntary school who suffer any pecuniary loss under the operation of the Bill when passed, by the abolition of office or by diminution of or loss of fees or salary, will be treated in precisely the same way as teachers in a board school.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Teachers in a voluntary school are not transferred under the operation of the Bill to the County Council. The Schedule does not give any greater security of tenure to either class of teacher than was possessed before.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Soldiers Discharged in South Africa—Inducements to Settlement in the New Colonies.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will state how many soldiers have been discharged in South Africa; and whether he will consider any additional inducement, in the shape of reservists' pay, with a view to their permanently settling in the Transvaal or Orange River Colony.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The number of discharges in South Africa is as follows:—Regular Forces, 1,107; Volunteers, 249; Oversea Colonials, 1,236; these figures apply to the period from 1st June to 31st October. Imperial Yeomanry, 2,224; these figures apply to the period from 1st June to 30th September. The number of men transferred to the Reserve was, for the period 1st June to 31st October, 1,770. I cannot hold out hopes of giving additional pay to soldiers settling in the new colonies.

Provisional Regiment of Dragoons—Case of Ex-Sergeant Leonard.

MR. BUTCHER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is in a position to make any further statement in reference to the case of ex-Sergeant Leonard; whether investigations have been made into the truth of the statements contained in ex-Sergeant Leonard's letter of 8th October, 1902, as to the condition of the 1st Provisional Regiment of Dragoons; and, if so, whether he can state the result of those investigations, and what further steps he proposes to take in regard to this case.

MR. BRODRICK: Ex-Sergeant Leonard's case is as follows:—He has on several occasions been in trouble in his regiment. When the Carabineers went to South Africa he was not permitted to embark as not being a sufficiently good sergeant, but subsequently went with a draft. Before embarking he extended his service and was liable to complete twelve years, but after arrival in South Africa he represented himself as due to go to the Reserve, and his papers having been lost on board ship, he was permitted to return home in September last. Since being posted to the 1st Provisional Regiment of Dragoons at York he has three times been in trouble with the authorities. Sergeant Leonard's complaints were investigated by his Colonel, and if he was dissatisfied with the Colonel's decision, he was entitled to appeal to the General. This he did not do, but wrote instead to the Secretary of State complaining of his officers and of the condition of the regiment, and for this offence against discipline he was tried by Court Martial and reduced to the ranks. The general officer commanding the district has made an exhaustive enquiry into the state of the Provisional Regiment of Dragoons, and the Commander-in-Chief is considering whether any further measures are necessary. I should add that I have received a petition signed by 15,000 persons at York as a result of a mass meeting demanding a public inquiry into the allegations made by ex-Sergeant Leonard, but the House will realise that this is a matter which must be dealt with by the military authorities, and the course proposed would be subversive of all discipline.

Tattoo and Roll Calls.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Order 211, of September last, abolishing tattoo and roll calls, except reveille, is permissive or compulsory.

MR. BRODRICK: The only obligatory roll call is reveille. Other roll calls may be held on such occasions as may be ordered by officers commanding stations and units.

China Squadron—British North Borneo Coal.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will consider the expediency of utilising the coal of British North Borneo for the supply of His Majesty's vessels on the China Station.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): British North Borneo coal is not so well adapted for H.M. ships as the coal used on the China Station. It has been used in small quantities for many years, and it will continue to be so used.

India—Conduct of 9th Lancers at Sialkote.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will produce the Report of the military reviewing authority on the case of the 9th Lancers.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): I have not received any copy of the Report to which this Question refers, nor am I disposed to publish Papers in connection with the case.

Indian Customs and Military Accoutrements.

Lord ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that band instruments for military bands, and articles of military dress, such as spurs, military sword belts, and cap lines, are taxed by the Customs Department when entering the country; and whether, in view of the fact that officers are obliged to contribute to the support of regimental bands, and that the instruments are so far State property that the State contributes towards the maintenance of these bands, which, with their taxed instruments, are essential to ceremonial parades, he will undertake to approach the Indian Government in order that such articles and all other articles imported into India for the use of military officers, provided they are for military purposes, may be exempted from taxation.

Earl PERCY: Military dress and accoutrements brought into India as personal baggage by officers are, I believe, already exempt from Customs duty under the regulations respecting passengers' *bonâ fide* luggage. I doubt whether the Government of India will be prepared to go further, but I will refer the matter to them. If indents for stores for *bonâ fide* regimental use are made on the Store Department at the India Office they can be supplied free of taxation.

Secret Treaties with Foreign Powers.

Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state whether any secret agreement was signed in the year 1844, or at any other time, by Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Aberdeen, and the Czar of Russia.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord Cranborne, Rochester): No trace of any such agreement can be found in the Archives of the Foreign Office, nor in the collection of Treaties and Conventions between Russia and Great Britain published officially by the Russian Government. It was stated by Lord Aberdeen in the House of Lords on the 13th March, 1854,† that the communications which the Emperor Nicholas had had with him and the Duke of Wellington were verbal and that he was not aware whether His Majesty had had any with Sir Robert Peel.

Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: May I ask whether there is any system or custom in the conduct of foreign affairs which would permit such a secret agreement to exist without its being in the Foreign Office?

Lord CRANBORNE: I think my hon. friend will see that, above all other Questions, this is one of which he would do well to give notice.

North British Railway—Tow-Roping at Ayton Station.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Report of Sub-Inspectors of Railways on Accidents recently issued shows that on the 30th June last a goods guard employed on the North British Railway was injured while engaged in tow-roping at Ayton railway station; and will he take steps for the discontinuance of tow-roping at this station.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): The Report in question was made to the Board of Trade and considered by them. In forwarding it to the railway company concerned, the Board invited their observations upon the sub-inspector's recommendation that means should be adopted to put an end to tow-roping and similar methods of working. The company replied that they did not see their way to take this action. The Board pressed the matter upon the further attention of the company, who, however, refuse to admit the necessity of the alteration recommended, and state that the traffic at this place is very limited in amount. The Board must therefore leave the railway company to consider their position under the Prevention of Accidents Rule recently made, which provides that after the 8th of August next tow-roping shall not be allowed except in cases where no other reasonably practical means can be provided for dealing with the traffic.

---

† See (3) *Debates*, cxxxi., p. 633.

Scottish Harbours—Grants in Aid.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that the conditions under which applications for grants in aid of harbours in Scotland are entertained by the Committee appointed in 1899 are of such a nature as to cause applications from Portmahomack, Broad Bay, and Valtos, Ross-shire, to be rejected, will he consider the expediency of arranging for the regulations to be relaxed so that it may be practicable for grants in aid of harbours to be obtained by the local authorities for places such as the three above indicated.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to his Question on 22nd April last, in which I stated that the Treasury were not prepared to relax the regulations under which grants in aid are made to harbours.†

Small Holdings Act, 1892.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will state the number of owners, and the acreage of land acquired under the provisions of the Small Holdings Act, 1892.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The latest information available as to the operations of Local Authorities under the Small Holdings Act, 1892, is that given in the Returns No. 407 of 1895 (Session 2 and 17 of 1898. At the date of the first-mentioned Return 483 acres had been acquired by County Councils and about 180 small holdings provided. I am obliged to the hon. Member for having put this Question, because although I have no power to compel such a Return, and can only have it by the courtesy of the local authorities, I do think the information ought to be kept up to date.

Mr. LAMBERT: And you will give us a more recent Return, then?

MR. HANBURY: Yes, I will get a Return up to date.

Admission of Prisoners to Bail.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that at the Somerset Assizes at Taunton on the 4th instant, Mr. Justice Wright commented on the fact that several prisoners awaiting their trial had been kept in prison several months without being afforded an opportunity of bail; and will he consider the expediency of ordering an inquiry on the subject.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): This is a matter which constantly engages the attention of the Home Department, and steps are taken from time to time, by circular or otherwise, to bring specially to the notice of magistrates their powers and duties in the matter of admitting prisoners to bail. I am not clear as to what kind of inquiry my hon. friend has in mind; and for myself I cannot do more than say that I will carefully consider whether some further action in the direction indicated above can usefully be taken.

Cruelty to Children—Penruddocke Case.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the result of the Penruddocke case, and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: My attention has been called to the case, but it is not one in which I have any jurisdiction, nor can I express any opinion on the course which the Judge thought fit to adopt. The matter was entirely in the Judge's discretion, as the Act prescribing the penalties that can be inflicted in such a case fixes wide limits calculated to allow a suitable penalty for every case. The penalty on indictment may be anything up to £100, or may be a sentence of imprisonment not exceeding two years, either by way of alternative or in addition to the fine. The only alteration which would appear to be suggested is to the effect of prescribing a fixed or minimum penalty for all cases. This could only be done by legislation; and not only would it be sure to operate most unjustly in certain cases, but the principle of fixing minimum penalties is contrary to the whole tendency and practice of modern legislation.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, civ., 936.

MR. TULLY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why there is one law for the rich and another for the poor? Why was not the lady sent to prison?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

British North Borneo Mails.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in considering renewed contracts with the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails to the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and other parts of the East, arrangements will be made for steamers to call at a port in British North Borneo.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I will bear the hon. Member's suggestion in mind for consideration when the Eastern mail arrangements are revised; but I may say at once that, in view of the small amount of correspondence involved, the intricate navigation between Singapore and Sandakan, and the distance of over 1,000 miles between the two ports, it seems hardly likely that either a branch line or a diversion of the main line packets conveying the Eastern mails will prove justifiable.

Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the attention of the Secretary for Scotland has been called to the case of illegal trawling in Broad Bay, Island of Lewis, on the 12th October last, which recently came before Sheriff Squair at Stornoway, and resulted in the master of the trawler "Coquet" (A 390) being fined £50; and, seeing that there have been four convictions in the local courts for illegal trawling in Broad Bay since the 1st January last, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of introducing legislation such as will admit of the certificates of masters of vessels engaged in illegal trawling being suspended, and the trawler interdicted for a fixed period from engaging in trawling operations.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland is aware of the case of the "Coquet." The other cases referred to by the hon. Member were not all from Broad Bay, and the convictions referred to were against separate trawlers. In none of the cases was there a repetition of the offence, and in only one case was the maximum penalty imposed. The Secretary for Scotland cannot undertake to promise legislation on the subject at present.

Irish Post Office and the Irish Language.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he has received any complaints from the Secretary of the Navan Gaelic League as to the refusal of the local postal authorities to furnish him with a money order because the name of the payee was in Irish; and what steps he proposes to take to comply with the wishes of a very large section of the Irish people in this matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: My attention has been drawn to this case, and I have caused the complainant to be informed that, as the names of the remitter and payee of a money order have to be advised from office to office, the writing of such names in Irish characters on a requisition form cannot be sanctioned.

MR. TULLY: Will not the right hon. Gentleman make some concession to Irish feeling in this matter?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid the Post Office cannot be used as a seminary for teaching the Irish language.

Belfast Telegraph Offices.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will consider the advisability of putting a telegraph office in the Donegal Street Post Office, Belfast, for the convenience of the district.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I find that my predecessor considered this matter more than once, and came to the conclusion that he would not be justified in establishing a telegraph office at Donegal Street, because the head post office of Belfast was within a quarter of a mile in one direction, and there were three other offices at a distance but little greater in other directions. I see no reason for departing from that decision.

Foreign Prison-made Goods.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the total value of foreign prison-made goods excluded from this country under the operations of the Foreign Prison-made Goods Act.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES-FISHER, Fulham): £183 4s.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): And what quantity of these goods have evaded the regulations?

[No answer was returned.]

Solicitors and the Irish Language.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Incorporated Law Society have refused to make Irish an optional subject in the examinations for admission to the solicitors' profession; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I have no information on the first part of the Question. The subjects for examination are prescribed by regulations made by the Incorporated Law Society in pursuance of the 8th Section of the Solicitors (Ireland) Act, 1898. I have no authority to intervene in the matter.

Belfast Teachers' Salaries.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that, in Belfast, payments described as balance of grade salary for the quarter ending 31st March, 1901, are being paid to some teachers and withheld from others; if he will state how this balance accrued, and on what basis it has been calculated; and if he will arrange that all money due to teachers may be paid forthwith.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Commissioners of National Education report as follows:—In the payment of salary made to teachers in April, 1901, was included the balance of residual grant for the year 1900. In some cases this balance left the portion of "fixed" or grade salary for the quarter ended 31st March, 1901, less than what teachers were entitled to for that quarter, consequent on the division of their consolidated incomes into two portions in 1901. It is in such cases that the balance of grade salary is now being paid. This payment has not been withheld in any case where it was shown to the Commissioners that a balance of grade salary was due. The payments are still in progress.

Irish Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a report by the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools of Ireland, in which the Inspector complains as to the condition of health of the children in the schools and the neglect of his recommendations as to housing, food, clothing, and exercise; and, seeing that the Inspector alleges that children are provided with unsuitable diet, notwithstanding that the cost per child is £20 per annum, will he take steps to investigate these allegations.

MR. WYNDHAM: The condition of things referred to in the Inspector's report existed in comparatively few schools. In some of these improvements have since been effected, while in others preventive measures will be undertaken. The matter is receiving the special attention of the Inspector, who frequently visits the schools.

Dromore Disturbances.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the district inspector of police was not present in Dromore on the occasion of the riot at the land meeting; why were extra police not summoned from Banbridge, Lurgan, and the adjoining towns; who was it paid for the drink given free in more than one public-house on that day; and whether he can state the nature of the protection that will be afforded at further meetings in the North of Ireland in connection with the question of compulsory sale.

MR. WYNDHAM: An inquiry has been instituted. Pending its result I cannot discuss the circumstances. The nature of protection in the future will depend on the exigencies of each case. It will invariably be ample.

MR. TULLY: What protection will be afforded to Mr. Russell in his crusade? Surely he is entitled to it.

MR. WYNDHAM: Ample protection.

Irish Dispensary Medical Officers.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board sanction the payment to a medical *locum tenens* of £4 per week, which falls upon the local rates, while they refuse their sanction to a salary to a dispensary medical officer of £200 a year, half of which is paid by the Treasury; and what steps will be taken to remedy this inequality.

MR. WYNDHAM: No proper analogy can be drawn between the remuneration paid to a dispensary medical officer, permanently located in a district, and to his *locum tenens*, who may be employed for a week or two only. The question of the determination of the respective emoluments of a principal and of his temporary substitute is governed by different considerations in each case.

Case of Michael Fahy.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the Ballyvaughan Petty Sessions (County Clare) on the 13th instant, a young man named Michael Fahy was fined by Captain H. de Vere Pery, R.M., for attacking a dwelling house, although the police sergeant and another constable swore that, as they had Fahy under observation at the time, it was impossible for him to have committed the offence; and whether he proposes to order an investigation into the circumstances connected with this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: The sergeant swore that at the time of the alleged attack he was in the vicinity of the house, but he did not swear that he had the accused under observation. The latter was identified by two witnesses. No constable was examined in the case.

Irish Dictionary.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount paid out of the public funds to Professor Atkinson, of Trinity College, for the preparation of an Irish dictionary; and if he can indicate in what stage that work now stands.

MR. WYNDHAM: No payment has been made to Professor Atkinson by the Royal Irish Academy. On Tuesday of last week I indicated the progress made in the preparation of the dictionary.†

Education Bill—Definition of "Education."

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will add to the Education Bill a definition of the word "education"; and if not, will he say whether the terms "educational grounds" and "grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction" are mutually exclusive.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think that the terms to which the hon. Member refers are, taken with their context, mutually exclusive. I should be sorry to embark on such a Herculean task as that of defining "education."

MR. BLACK: Does the hon. Gentleman then regard religious education as outside the sphere of "education"?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. The hon. Member must not extend my answer to cover that general proposition. I am talking of the legal interpretation of a particular Clause, and not of the broader question. He might as well ask me whether I regard the home life of a child as outside the sphere of "education." Of course, in one sense, it is the most important part of education; but it is not referred to in this Bill.

---

† See preceding volume, page 1237.

Education Bill—Position of Teachers.

MR. BLACK: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, under the scheme of the Education Bill, the consent of the local education authority will be required to the dismissal of a teacher on grounds determined by the Board of Education not to be connected with the giving of religious instruction, even although such dismissal may previously have been ordered or confirmed by a bishop.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In the case put the consent of the local authority would be required. I may observe that the hypothesis to which the hon. Member calls my attention presents a case which is, I think, almost impossible, and which, at any rate, could hardly ever arise.

Education Bill—Position of Welsh Intermediate Schools.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire); I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, if the Education (England and Wales) Bill passes in its present form it will operate to abolish the local managing bodies of intermediate schools established by schemes under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The answer is in the negative.

The Cunard Subsidy.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state on what date will the Government agreement with regard to a subsidy to the Cunard Line of steamers be submitted to the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is impossible at present to fix a date.

MR. SCHWANN: Will it be taken this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In the present state of business, I cannot promise a date in the present session.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the President of the Board of Trade promised us a date in the course of this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, if a pledge was given, I will do my best to redeem it, but I hope that the House will have consideration for the amount of labour already imposed on us.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I hope that, if this Cunard agreement is laid on the Table, the Morgan agreement will be laid at the same time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Before I answer I should like to consult the President of the Board of Trade.

1903 Session.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that many hon. Members are making their plans for the winter, he will now state at what date His Majesty's Government propose to call Parliament together for the session of 1903.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The present session is not yet concluded, and we have a great deal of work still to do. It would be premature to discuss when we are to meet for the next session.

MR. CHANNING: I shall repeat the Question next week.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BRYCE: It would greatly assist hon. Members in fixing their arrangements for next week if the right hon. Gentleman can tell the House what will be the business on Friday in next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Water Bill will be taken on Thursday, and in all probability it will be continued on Friday.

MR. LAMBERT: May I ask whether, when the new Rules are considered on Monday, it will be possible to discuss the hour of meeting of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall have to refer to the Sessional Order. I imagine the question turns on a very simple principle. It is only the new Sessional

Orders which come up for discussion. The changes made in the old Standing Orders — many of them of as much importance as the new Sessional Orders—will not come up for discussion; and if, as I think, the hour of the House's meeting is embodied in an old Standing Order, it cannot be discussed.

MR. BRYCE: As the point is of great importance, I would ask whether, if it were conveyed to the right hon. Gentleman that there is a general desire on the part of the House to reconsider the hour of meeting, he would afford an opportunity for discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that this session we can do more with the Rules than make the Sessional Orders Standing Orders. Any continuation of the Government's programme as regards the business of the House must be deferred to next session.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the motion for making the Sessional Orders Standing Order, be put simply as one Question, or will each Order be put separately?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As in the case of the 1882 precedent, all the Rules will be included in one Resolution.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): Can an Amendment be moved to leave out a particular Rule?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not at all sure that I have not been answering Questions which I had no right to touch upon. Any other Questions as to what can or cannot be done should be referred to the Chair, the only authority in these matters.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

(2.35.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) moved to leave out the word "secular," his intention being consequentially to move to insert, after the words "not provided by them," the words "subject to the provisions of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, Section 14, sub-Section 2." He said he was aware that the Amendment he had to propose, together with the consequential one which followed, revived the religious controversies of which the House was getting tired; but still this was the first time the question had been raised in that particular form. It was exactly the antithesis of the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich which they discussed on the previous day. The principle underlying the noble Lord's new Clause was that the Cowper-Temple provision should be abolished with our elementary education system, while the principle underlying the Amendment he was proposing was that the provision should run in all schools, whether provided or non-provided. That principle was fought for very strongly during the education conflict of 1870—the principle that there should be no denominational or dogmatic teaching in rate-aided schools. It was adopted on the Motion of a Conservative Member of the House, and was almost universally accepted. Surely, what was held to be unjust in those days remained equally unjust today. In the interval which had since elapsed such progress had been made in the principle of religious liberty as should make them chary of inflicting the disability upon a large proportion of the community, and additional reasons now existed. There had, for instance, been a remarkable growth of Free Churches, which were now a great power in the country, and, in addition, there had been a growth of sacerdotalism. The right hon. Gentleman must bear in mind that this objection to dogmatic teaching in rate-aided schools was not raised by a few loud-mouthed speakers or mendacious pamphleteers, but it was raised by more than one-half of the citizens of this country. It did not come entirely from those who dissented from the Established Church, and had the Prime Minister realised these facts he would not have acted on the principle underlying the Bill. In a somewhat remarkable novel lately issued, the talented author put into the mouth of the King the words: "I am just now in a humour to satisfy the demands of the nation rather than the demands of the Church." Had the Prime Minister acted on a similar principle they might have avoided many religious discussions. Archdeacon Pelham, the son of the late Bishop of Norwich, only the other day wrote :—

> "Let the Cooper-Temple Clause be extended to all elementary schools alike, with the proviso that once a week in all schools alike, denominational religious instruction, according to the wishes of the parents, is given to the children."

And again, at a meeting in the city of Norwich it was resolved—

> "(1) That religious instruction in all elementary schools alike be secured by statute with a Conscience Clause. (2) That religious instruction be based on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament and shall include the teaching of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, and (3) That the religious instruction be given by the teachers of the school and by them only."

He could add evidence from other leading Churchmen from all parts of the country which went to show that, as long as dogma was taught in rate-aided schools, there would be a sense of injustice, and he was sure that there were many hon. Members behind the Prime Minister who believed in the principle he was now submitting to the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House had said, in dealing with a kindred subject, that they could not betray the men who sent them there. But in insisting on dogmatic teaching in rate-aided schools the right hon. Gentleman was betraying the very men who placed the Government in their present position. There were thousands of Nonconformists who supported the Tory Party at the last General Election who felt that they were being unjustly betrayed in this matter. Those Nonconformists were in number equal to the majority which gave the Government its present position, and the Government could have done nothing which would have provoked more determined opposition from those supporters than to impart the religious aspect they had given to this Bill. Simple Bible teaching in the schools would satisfy the great majority of the people of this country. They could not hope, of course, to satisfy such men as Mr. Athelstan Riley, who had asserted that to teach the Bible only was worse than no religion. But it was the action of such extreme men as this that they had cause to fear; they did not want them to have the control of religious education in the schools. He would like to submit to the Prime Minister one fact, and that was, that in some 8,000 parishes the people would be in this condition. While they were strongly in favour of the religious teaching of their children, they objected to dogmatic teaching, but the only alternative open to them would be either dogmatic teaching or no religious teaching at all, for if they objected to dogmatic teaching the children would have to be withdrawn from religious teaching altogether. Was it worth the while of the Government to carry a Bill bearing this stamp of injustice upon it? In many parishes in his own constituency two-thirds of the children in denominational day-schools were to be found in Primitive Methodist and Wesleyan Sunday Schools. It might be said that if no Amendment were adopted the *raison d'être* for voluntary schools would be abolished. But the teaching advocated by the Amendment was very simple, and it could easily be supplemented denominationally. As John Bright once said, all that was necessary was the teaching of virtue, truth, honesty, and the fear of God. The fact was that the Prime Minister, fearing to anger the priests, had yielded to their demands, and was thereby angering the people. Lord Palmerston, on one occasion, said that legislation followed the conscience of the Nonconformists, and history proved the truth of that assertion. At any rate, half of the community were absolutely determined that they could not, under present conditions, submit to the imposition of a rate for the teaching of those doctrines which they believed to be absolutely erroneous, and if the Bill was passed in its present form he was sure that the country was entering upon a war which would be carried on until justice was obtained. He believed that if the Prime Minister had had his own way and had not been influenced by the clerical powers behind him, he would have imparted a very different character to the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 3, line 2, to leave out the word 'secular.'"—(*Mr. George White.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'secular' stand part of the Bill."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said his hon. friend had moved his Amendment as if it were inseparably connected with his second Amendment. He did not agree with that, and his own support of the Motion would largely depend on other considerations. The Amendment of his hon. friend, taken with a consequential Amendment, had for its object the imposition of the Cowper-Temple Clause on every assisted school in the country. But this Clause must be read in conjunction with Clause 16, continuing the grant to certain public elementary schools which were not maintained by the authority. He doubted if his hon. friend's Amendment would cover institution schools. He thought that the Government proposal was entirely unworkable, and when hon. Members came to explain to the constituencies at the next County Council elections the meaning of Clause 5, he did not believe that the plain British elector would be able to understand what the House had done. Hon. members would have to tell the constituencies that under this Clause the secular instruction in all the aided schools was in the control of the local education authority, although it was administered by teachers who were not appointed by them. In regard to one part of their duties, the managers were to be the mere creatures of the local authority, while in regard to another part they were to be in a superior position to the local authority. In the long run the plan of the Bill, he was convinced, would break down. The first part of the Amendment altered the bargain between the Church and the State altogether, but it was much less violent than forcing the Cowper-Temple Clause on all the denominational schools of the country. The first part of the Amendment would place the general control of all education in the hands of the local education authority, but subject to the trusts of the school. It would place the authority in their proper position as the supreme education authority for the whole of their district, but in regard to the religious portion of the teaching in the schools, they would have to have regard to the character imprinted on the schools by the trust deeds. The Church itself had repudiated the bargain with the State, and used language which would add to the difficulty of working the new system. The Bishop of London, who had distinctly spoken of the "bargain" between the Church and the State, had attacked even the foundation managers as regarded their control of the religious part of education in such a way as enormously to increase the likelihood of friction. There would be a much greater chance of peace in the working of the Bill if the local education authority were given a general control over education of all kinds within their district. When Mr. Birrell spoke of the English country gentlemen as being in some cases careless of education and no better than "Tony Lumpkins," there was great irritation on the other side. But the Bishop of London had referred to the foundation managers as "Squire Western and his head gardener and farmer." Under the scheme of the Bill, if they had a "Squire Western" managing the education, he would probably have been placed in that position by the present chairman of the managers—by his "Parson Supple." Surely such language did not add to the chances of the smooth working of the Bill. There was a very strong case for the first part of the Amendment, which did not necessarily involve the imposition of the Cowper-Temple Clause on all the aided schools in the country. When this Bill had to be placed before the electorate at the County Council elections, he would rather have an intelligible and workable scheme to explain than one involving litigation and ill-feeling, as he was convinced this limitation of Clause 5 would.

(3.4.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Baronet had added another to the many subjects that had been discussed during the progress of the Bill. If they had not had much education, they had, at all events, had a great deal of theology, with some local government; and now, apparently, a course of literature was to be added to those extensive fields of learning, and the House were to consider by which of the characters in classical English fiction the foundation managers were most happily and accurately described. He would not discuss either the character mentioned by Mr. Birrell or those which commended themselves to the Bishop of London; they were both outside the scope of the Amendment. He would rather call the attention of the House to the avowed inconsistency between the speech of the mover of the Amendment and that of the right hon. Baronet who proposed to support only a part of the Amendment. The mover of the Amendment had based his argument on, amongst other reasons, what he called the "fundamental principle" that rates ought not to be used for the support of schools in which denominational teaching was given. He had never been able to see on what ground that was called a "fundamental principle" either of morals or of politics, but, even if it were, it was entirely thrown to the winds by the right hon. Baronet, because he was prepared to accept a scheme which did indeed remove the foundation managers and the denomination itself from any control of the teaching in the schools, but substituted for them the local authority, who were to be required to provide denominational teaching in accordance with the trust deeds.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE pointed out that his plan had reference to the present condition of the Bill; it was not the plan he would have proposed if he had had a chance of framing a Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR agreed that possibly it was a counsel of despair, but at all events it was the plan suggested in the present condition of the Bill. The right hon. Baronet would be the first to admit that it was as radical a contradiction of what the hon. Member had described as a fundamental principle as the provisions of the Bill itself. In both cases rates were applied to schools in which denominational teaching was not only permitted, but required in accordance with the character of the trust deeds. The second argument of the hon. Member, on which he relied even more than on his first, was based on the growth of what he described as sacerdotalism in the Church of England. He had declared that an immense change had taken place in this repect since 1870, and that the majority of the population now objected to these denominational schools—not on the rather abstract, and, as he ventured to think, untenable distinction between the rights of education, but on the broader and more practical grounds that in a large number of these schools under the guise of Church of England teaching there was carried on a propaganda of doctrine with which the majority of the Church of England did not agree. He for his part did not at all deny—he was afraid it was the fact—that in a few schools there had been teaching which, if he might express a personal opinion, was absolutely inconsistent with the whole spirit of Church of England doctrine, with its history and its traditions, but he ventured to think, in the first place, that the provisions of this Bill would completely put an end to those cases; and, in the second place, he could not help thinking that the number of such schools had been very greatly exaggerated. Because there were a few Church of England schools where non-Church of England doctrine had been, he thought, unfortunately permitted, surely that was not a sufficient reason for attempting to destroy the whole mass of denominational schools in this country, which had done, and which he hoped were likely to do, such enormous benefit to the education of the younger generation. The hon. Gentleman had declared that there was a large school of Protestant opinion which denied that the Bible was the common foundation of our religion. He did not believe there was a single individual of whom that could be said. Mr. Athelstan Riley had been quoted, but he should be surprised if Mr. Althelstan Riley would agree to the representation of his doctrine given by the hon. Gentleman. He was perfectly certain that the great body of Church of England opinion in this country would assert as strongly as the hon. Gentleman that the Bible was the foundation of the religion which they professed. The hon. Gentleman laid down two propositions—one that it was absolutely wrong to teach dogma, and the other that it was absolutely right to teach Christianity. Those two propositions were absolutely contradictory.

MR. GEORGE WHITE: To teach dogma under certain conditions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then the hon. Gentleman is in favour of teaching dogma?

Mr. GEORGE WHITE: The position I laid down was that it was wrong to teach dogma in rate-aided schools.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood that, and he was referring only to rate-aided schools. The hon. Gentleman argued that it was wrong to teach dogma in rate-aided schools, but that it was right to teach Christianity in rate-aided schools. Those two propositions were absolutely inconsistent, and he would defy any man to get up in the House and attempt to prove with the smallest regard for the elements of logic that it was inconsistent with any general principle of morality to teach what was called dogmatic Christianity without every argument which he used being capable of being turned round to deal with what was called undogmatic Christianity. There was no such thing as undogmatic Christianity. Every religion contained propositions of dogma. A religious proposition was a dogma, and a dogma was a religious proposition. They could not escape dogma. They might escape what the courts of law or the Board of Education chose to describe as dogma characteristic of one particular denomination, but when they had escaped that they could not avoid the difficulties that at once met them when they tried to apply the principle all round. Unfortunately, the whole population of the kingdom were not Christians. How were they going to deal with that part of the population which did not believe even in what was called undogmatic Christianity? They had to pay rates for the teaching of a religion which they did not believe in. He could not understand why it commended itself to the hon. Member's view of abstract morality that religion should be taught in the way he and his friends liked, while all the higher principles of morality were violated whenever they attempted to teach religion which differed from the law which the hon. Gentleman laid down for himself and his friends. He was not sure that he ought to have trespassed so much upon first principles on the Report Stage of this Bill. The hon. Member's speech seemed to him to be one which would have been more appropriate to the First, Second or Third Reading than to either the Committee or the Report Stage. He was aware that he had repeated many things which he had said to the House on previous occasions, but he thought it was only courteous to remind the hon. Member of the reasons why the Government found it absolutely impossible to accept the suggestions he had made.

*Mr. LUCAS (Portsmouth) said he should like to say a word or two upon this question. He thought the speech made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon yesterday was one of the most important speeches made this session. Speaking for his constituents, the hon. Member for Carnarvon divided the opponents of this Bill into two classes, those actuated by great hostility to the Church of England and those who were not anxious about religion at all. He would leave the hon. Member to settle with his own constituents the general charge that a very large number of them did not care very much whether there was any religious teaching at all. According to the hon. Member a very large number of parents did not care whether their children received any religious teaching whatever, and they left religion severely alone. These were the conscientious objectors to this Clause, and it seemed to him that their consciences were in a very bad condition. From the very beginning of these discussions the supporters of this Bill had not had any desire to injure in the slightest degree the Nonconformists. In the first place they could not have done so if they had wished to, and in the second place they would not be fools enough to try. The hon. Member for Carnarvon had made a boast that if the spirit of this Bill were carried into effect they would use the measure as a weapon——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now discussing a speech made upon another Amendment yesterday which has no particular bearing upon the question before the House. The question before the House is whether the local authority or the managers should have the control of the religious education.

*Mr. LUCAS said his difficulty was to know upon which Amendments the discussion of religious instruction was out of order. No Member of the House of Commons was listened to with more pleasure than the hon. Member for Carnarvon—he did not know whether he was read with so much pleasure in the country.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is continuing a debate on a speech made yesterday, which really has no bearing upon the question before the House.

*MR. LUCAS said that he had now said all he wanted to say upon this subject.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that that is hardly a respectful way of treating the Chair.

*MR. LUCAS said he did not mean to be disrespectful, and what he intended to say was that he had said all he wished to say before Mr. Speaker stopped him, and that therefore he would not attempt to pursue the subject.

MR. BRYCE said that this Amendment would simply have the effect of making the local authority supreme over all the education given in the school. He thought it would be a great deal better for the working of the Government system if the local authority was made supreme over every kind of instruction. The argument for this Amendment was that they might avoid a certain amount of friction, and although other kinds of friction might arise, they might fairly expect that public bodies would respect the denominational character of the schools if the Legislature intended and directed them to respect it. That was the effect of the Amendment which they were now discussing, and he thought it ought to be judged upon its own merits. He thought this proposal would work better than the system contained in the Bill. As for the Cowper-Temple Clause, it was perfectly true, as had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman, that it was not logical. It did not meet the cases of the Jews, the Roman Catholics, and those who did not hold any form of Christianity. It was, in point of fact, a compromise between the two sections of opinion which existed in 1870. It was a compromise between pure secularism and pure denominationalism. He remembered very well the discussions which took place in 1870. This was not defended then as a logical system, but as a working compromise. They might appeal to the experience of the past thirty-two years to show that it was a compromise which had worked fairly well. The reason why it had worked fairly well was because it corresponded——

MR. SPEAKER: The next Amendment proposes to insert a reference to the Cowper-Temple Clause, and the proper time to discuss it will be when that Amendment is proposed. If it is understood that that Amendment is not to be proposed, I shall not prevent the right hon. Gentleman from dealing with the question now; but it seems to me that this line of argument is hardly relevant on the present Amendment.

MR. BRYCE explained that he was only endeavouring to put the other side to that put by the First Lord of the Treasury, but of course he would not persist.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said that one great object to be desired was that matters should be simplified in connection with the management of the schools. If they took out the word "secular," they would find that thereby all the instruction in the school would be carried on by one authority. He spoke on behalf of those who had to carry on a large amount of this work, and he would ask that every opportunity should be given to simplify and make plain work which had to be done under very great difficulties. There was no question that the having of two authorities in the school was an exceedingly difficult position. There must be more or less a conflict between the two parties, and it was therefore exceedingly desirable that there should be entirely one management if possible.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) said the hon. Member who proposed the Amendment, while regarding it as unjust to levy a rate for denominational teaching, seemed to think it was quite right to levy a rate for teaching the New Testament. To apply that to the Jews seemed to him a very illogical argument, and one that would not bear consideration. He wished to show what would be the logical result of the arguments put forth on this Amendment. A decision had lately been given by the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, in which they had laid it down that it was unconstitutional for a teacher in any public school in the State to read passages from the Bible, 'cause the singing of hymns, or to offer prayers to the Deity. That was the logical consequence of the arguments put forward. The hon. Member also stated that such teaching as he recommended was satisfactory to the Nonconformists. Might he be allowed to give the House a statement by a distinguished Congregational minister, the late Dr. Dale of Birmingham? In his "Life," published two or three years ago, there was the following passage—

> "Any explanation of the Bible that could be regarded as 'undogmatic' he has always regarded with distrust. In the debate on the scheme of religious education proposed by the majority, he argued that religious teaching which would not be likely 'to attach the children to any particular denomination' would end in detaching them from all. He expressed his alarm at the tendency of modern thought to depreciate the importance of definite religious teaching, and his conviction that nothing was so likely to bring about the destruction of whatever religious faith still survived in England."

He ventured to suggest that the late Dr. Dale was a higher authority than the Member for North-West Norfolk, and on that ground he would oppose the Amendment.

(3.36.) Question put,

"That the word 'secular' stand part of the Clause."

The House divided:—Ayes, 171; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 583.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Joscelyne FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn W G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrison, James Archibald
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C R (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George White and Mr. Runciman.

MR. CHANNING, who had an Amendment to strike out the words "School Boards shall be abolished," said that in view of the two decisions of the House the previous day he did not think it would be desirable to detain the House by discussing his Amendment, and he would therefore not move it.

*(3.50.) MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury), in moving the Amendment standing in his name, said that he approached this subject of the single-area schools with diffidence because it was one which it was hoped, not so long ago, would have been made the subject of compromise by the Government. There had, however, been no concessions made by the Government The words of his Amendment were practically the same as those moved by the hon. Member for East Mayo some time in July last. The object he had in moving the Amendment was that, in single-school areas, there should be a different mode of control of the school to the extent of allowing that area to have its managers publicly appointed. That Amendment was resisted by the Government, but he noticed, in looking up the reports in *Hansard*, that the

First Lord of the Treasury admitted the grievance which the hon. Member or East Mayo was going to cure. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that he was deeply disappointed by the attitude taken up by the First Lord. It was a question on which he thought the right hon. Gentleman would at least be willing to make an effort to meet the admitted grievance of the Nonconformists, and the First Lord replied, "I said I would meet it." Now, they on that side of the House had asked the First Lord to meet it, but up to the present time no change had been made in the Bill which could be said to alleviate this grievance. He believed that the principle involved in his consequential Amendment went much further than that of the hon. Member for East Mayo, and that it would, to a large extent, relieve the grievance in those areas where the schools were a monopoly of one Church, and where the Church alone had the right to appoint the majority of the managers. The single school areas had been stated to be over 8,000 in number, but that had been contradicted by the representatives of the Church who said that they only numbered 6,108; even the latter ought to merit the consideration of the Government. Roughly speaking, there were 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 of people resident in the rural villages, and he presumed that nearly 4,000,000 children were entirely dependent for their education on the Church schools. Now, in these rural villages there were great masses of Nonconformists—not only in Wales, which was so often quoted, but in the west of England, in the Midlands, in the east, and in the north of England—where the parents naturally objected to have their children educated in what they though was a Chhurch atmosphere. They had no alternative but to send their children to these voluntary schools; and no Conscience Clause could entirely do away with the Church atmosphere. The Attorney General, during the course of these discussions, stated that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen was quite correct in saying that the Government recognised that there was a grievance in these single-school areas, and that the Government proposed to deal with it in the Report stage of the Bill. What they asked of the Government was to fulfil their pledges on the Report stage. This grievance was not only admitted by the Government, but it was admitted even by the Church of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and several other dignitaries had admitted that in single school areas the grievance was so great as not only to be justifiable but to merit a cure. The cure put forward in the Bill was that the Nonconformists should be allowed to build new denominational schools; but it was absurd to expect that poor Nonconformists in the villages should provide from £700 to £1,000 in order to erect a structure in which to secure religious equality. If riches were to be a criterion of religious equality, he did not think that it would satisfy either the Nonconformists or others concerned. There could be no religious equality for the poor under the new denominational schools Clauses. There was an ideal that every religion should have a school of its own. That was perfectly impossible and would lead to confusion. It was said that the "grievance could be met by permitting religious teaching in the schools such as the Nonconformist parents desired." That, however, would not get rid of what the Nonconformists complained—the Church atmosphere. There was bound to be a Church atmosphere where the teachers were appointed by the Church. Were the teaching profession thrown open and public control given in those village schools, then they might be prepared to accept the proposal that there should be a right of religious teaching outside the school hours, or some other arrangement which would not interfere with the working of the school, but which would allow religious teaching by the various denominations to be given to the children in the school building. But was it not absurd to suggest that any proposal of that kind could be made when the bishop was to be the final arbiter in religious disputes in these schools? Even if two managers of an alien religion were appointed on the board of management, the bishop would still be supreme. He knew that it was frequently pleaded that the position was no better than under the Act of 1870; but he wished to point out that the Act of 1870 had never fully satisfied the Nonconformist claim; and no one could state that with more force than the Colonial Secretary if he were there that day. Reference had been made to Dr. Dale, who declared that the Act of 1870 would never satisfy the Nonconformists. The fact was that the Act of 1870 created an intolerable strain under which the Nonconformists lived, and that intolerable strain was no less today than it was then. That feeling was a real and intense feeling. It had developed in its strongest form even amongst the Wesleyans, who had themselves their own denominational schools. At the recent Wesleyan Conference, again and again the complaint was made that "the primary object of Methodist policy in the matter of elementary education was the placing of a Christian unsectarian school within reasonable distance of every family;" and that policy was reaffirmed by them at the meeting of their special education committee which had taken place during the passage of the Bill through the House. Objection had been raised to the word "proselytizing" in the schools, but proselytizing was bound to go on in the Church schools. It might not be visible, but its influence and its effect were apparent. An hon. Member had said that proselytizing was almost unknown in the Church schools, but hundreds of cases could be quoted where proselytizing was carried on; and even if proselytizing was not carried on in its most active form, he ventured to assert that the Church atmosphere itself was sufficient to deserve the attention of the Government. Every hon. Member representing an agricultural constituency knew that the parents in agricultural districts for the sake of their children were induced to leave the country and go into towns where there were board schools. Any hon. Member who knew well the county districts, especially in the north of England, would know that the dearest aim of parents in agricultural districts was to see their children well educated without their religious feelings being outraged. The foundation of the settlement was not likely to be very stable if this grievance was not remedied. The hon. Member for East Mayo recognised that, when he moved his Amendments in the interests of the Catholic communion. Nonconformists were not likely to put up with schools which were the monopoly of the Church of England. Toleration was all very well in its way. Nonconformists did not like the word. Toleration was a stage they had passed long ago; and the demand they now made was a demand for religious equality.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 15, at beginning of sub-Section (2), to insert the words: 'Except in areas where there appears to the local education authority to be only one school available for children resident in such area.'"—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said he understood that the hon. Member's two Amendments should be taken together.

*MR. RUNCIMAN said he would be prepared to accept the compromise proposed by the hon. Member for East Mayo.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he should take the hon. Member's Amendment as he found it. The Amendment proposed that the school in every single school area should be treated as a school provided by the local authority, whatever the previous rights or conditions of the denominations to which it belonged. The hon. Member for East Mayo moved in substance the same proposal as long ago as last summer. That hon. Member admitted that it was a hardship to the denominations concerned; but he said it was necessary in the interests of denominationalism that some sacrifices should be made. It did not concern the great majority of Roman Catholic schools, and therefore the hon. Member was prepared to throw a child to the wolves of undenominationalism, having taken care, in the first instance, that it was some one else's child. He frankly admitted the difficulty of the single school areas. He had admitted it from time to time; it had been admitted by the Prime Minister; and various suggestions had been made, but the hardship was not, he thought, mainly, and certainly not entirely, on the children of Nonconformist parents who had to attend denominational schools. He did not think it was a great grievance in practice, and they heard little of it except on platforms and in the course of debates in that House. He could not, therefore, believe that the depopulation of their rural districts, which no one regretted more than he did, was due to the desire of the parents to send their children to schools in the towns. In order to remove the grievance, which was not a grievance of the children, but of the teachers, they had done something in other parts of the Bill by throwing open the teaching profession more widely than it was at present; and they had made further provision in Clauses 9 and 10, which he admitted was not entirely satisfactory, for the supply of other schools. They had extended the term necessary so that it should apply not merely to the numerical requirements of the population, but also in respect to the denominational requirements of the population. The whole question had been most carefully considered by the Government. The Prime Minister spoke yesterday of the time and trouble that had been expended in endeavouring to devise some scheme on the lines proposed by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich yesterday, and supported with much force and eloquence on both sides of the House. He confessed that, enamoured as he was at first with that proposal, he had come more and more to the conclusion that it was unworkable for the reason adduced by the Prime Minister; namely, that it would be unpopular with Anglican clergymen, who would not like Nonconformist ministers invading their schools, and with Nonconformists who would have to journey to the schools, oftentimes at considerable inconvenience; and it would also be unpopular with the teachers, who would find alien persons undertaking the teaching of the children during school hours. The more the solution of the difficulty was considered the more unsolvable it appeared; and he could not admit that the hon. Member had attained anything approaching a solution when he proposed to approach the question with a frank measure of confiscation. What the hon. Member proposed was that schools which had been built and maintained by a denomination for a number of years at great cost and sacrifice should, because they conflicted with the opinions of a number of Nonconformists within the area, and of more influential Nonconformists in political circles outside the area, be taken from the ownership and trust under which they existed, handed over to the local authority, and be treated as schools under Clause 14 of the Act of 1870, so that the religious teaching given in them should be under the Cowper-Temple Clause. He could not admit that that was a fair solution. He admitted the difficulty which had baffled the ingenuity of persons abler and with more knowledge than he possessed, but he could not admit that the proper way of cutting the Gordian knot was the appropriation of other people's property and labour, or that it was even a decent solution of the problem, which he was sure hon. Members on that side of the House desired to see solved to the satisfaction of all parties.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said that the hon. Gentleman admitted the grievance. The Government had admitted it over and over again, but had not helped the House to the solution. They criticised yesterday with perfect justice, not only from a theological point of view, but also from a practical point of view, the Amendment of the noble Lord; and no one spoke more tersely and strongly against it than did, that afternoon, the Secretary to the Board of Education. The point before the House was really the most difficult part of the Bill—namely, the separate treatment of a school area in which there was only one school. A great deal of the Nonconformist grievance, he would admit, did not exist in large towns. Practically there was no Nonconformist grievance where there was a choice of schools, and certainly no Church of England grievance where they had their own school.

* MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said there was a very distinct Church grevance in some districts of large towns, where there was an ample supply of board schools, but absolutely no provision for the definite religious education which was given in Church Schools.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that no doubt there were isolated districts in large towns where the school which was nearest and most convenient was a board school or a denominational school, as the case might be. A parent told a clerical friend of his that she sent her child to the school to reach which he had to pass the fewest crossings, although she was a member of the Church of England and no doubt wished her child brought up in the Church of England. For all practical purposes, however, there was no intolerable grievance in the large towns where there was a choice of schools, but there was an intolerable grievance in the country districts where there was but one school. He admitted that proselytizing did not exist to any great extent. The point was that there was a class of teaching in some schools which was not only offensive, but distressing to Nonconformist parents. He intended to put a question to the Secretary to the Board of Education with reference to a case which had been sent to him, and which had occurred within the last three weeks. He would now ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention had been drawn to a statement that thirty-one children attending the National School in a certain parish in Devonshire were withdrawn by Nonconformist parents from religious teaching in that school on 13th October. They were withdrawn because of the extreme ritualistic teaching in the school, which had reached a point which Protestant Nonconformist parents could not tolerate any longer. The vicar, on his next visit to the school, ordered all the children, eighty-one in number, to stand up and to repeat three times after the schoolmistress the following statement: "Fifty of us want the Bible, and thirty-one of us don't want the Bible." Was it possible to conceive a more contemptible and childish proceeding? He did not profess to be responsible for the allegation himself, and he would certainly give the hon. Gentleman (Sir William Anson) an opportunity of investigating it. He believed the story was uncontradicted by the clergyman himself, and the case was one in which he submitted that the Education Department ought to interfere and say whether the Conscience Clause had not been violated. It was these difficulties which did the mischief in a few cases, but the strength of a chain was the strength of its weakest link, and the strength of the denominational system was the folly of its weakest members. If the system was liable to this sort of folly, he was entitled to ask the Government to give the public such protection as they legitimately could. The Secretary to the Board of Education had said, "You want to confiscate the property of the denominations." He certainly did not wish to do so. He had no wish in any way to disturb the existing denominational system. He wished Church of England schools to remain Church of England schools; Wesleyan schools to remain Wesleyan schools; and Roman Catholic schools to remain Roman Catholic schools. Where, however, there was only one school in one area, he held that there ought to be exceptional treatment not only for one denomination but for all denominations. What was the solution arrived at by the Government. He was willing to admit that the denominational religious character ought to be maintained. He admitted that. He thought that if the Government had been content to rely in the first instance, or even in connection with what was called the Kenyon-Slaney Clause on the continuance of denominational teaching in those schools subject to the trusts of the deeds that would have been an intelligible proposition. But they would not rely upon that; they had excluded the principle of popular control from those schools. They gave the denominations specifically the majority on the management. They ought to have given the public the majority, in order to protect all sections of the public against causes of complaint such as that to which he had referred. He would substitute the proportion of four for the proportion of two, and *vice versâ*. That would render those acts of petty tyranny impossible. He did not wish to interfere with the town system, that was working fairly well at the present time, but there existed a distinct and separate grievance which would continue so long as there was only one school in a parish, and so long as we maintained that the religious teaching at the school should be under the control of one denomination unless some means of safe-guarding the civil and religious rights of the parents were adopted. This question was left unsettled, and it would be an open sore.

It would have to be dealt with even by this Government if it remained in office, and certainly a Liberal Government. It only aggravated our existing sectarian differences to leave open this question which the Government, with its huge majority, could settle and might settle even yet. Let them secure to the denominations who had taken part in erecting these schools all their denominational rights, but say to them that where their's was the only school in the district they would safe-guard the rights of the children in religious matters by putting the power, so far as the management of the school was concerned, in the hands, at all events, of the majority of the ratepayers. He would certainly support his hon. friend in this Amendment, although he would prefer that the ultimate solution of the difficulty should be found in putting the schools under effective and real popular control.

*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he wished to oppose this Amendment as strongly as he could. It related to 8,000 parishes in which there was only one school, and its intention was to put these schools under popular control. This Amendment affected thirty Roman Catholic schools. He had been trapped on the occasion when the hon. Member for East Mayo moved a similar Amendment to this which was written out for him by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool, and he had seen how the thing was misrepresented in Ireland by the untruthful reports which were sent over from this House that it was moved in the interest of the voluntary schools. The action of the hon. Member for East Mayo on that occasion was one that could not be described in any language which the Speaker would allow to be used in the House of Commons. But as he had been trapped on that occasion into voting entirely against his religious convictions, he intended now to atone for that by voting solid against this Amendment. The Member for East Mayo had no authority to speak for the Catholics of Ireland, either the clergy or the laity, when he brought forward his Amendment, which, had it been carried, would have given thirty Catholic schools over to secular education, to the exclusion of the religious element. That was the proposition of the hon. Member who had said he voiced the opinion of the Roman Catholics in Ireland. The belief of the Roman Catholics was that our Lord, when he commanded the Church to go forth and teach, commissioned the Church as the teaching authority, and not the public or the parents, and when the hon. Member for East Mayo moved an Amendment the same as this he would tear down the Church from its pedestal and give over the education to the public and the parents. He did what he had no right to do, and he wished to protest against such a doctrine going forth as representative of Irish feeling and Irish sentiment. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton had said that the safety of the voluntary schools depended on the folly of their weakest members. But did not the same remark apply to secular schools? If that was to be made the occasion for a threat in the House of Commons, he did not think it was one to which much importance need be attached. The Amendment, if incorporated in the Bill, would practically mean the closing of thirty Catholic schools in thirty parishes in England. In France, when the Prime Minister of that country proposed his attack upon them, the Roman Catholics said they were prepared to close their schools and convents rather than submit to their secularisation. This Amendment, if carried, would do in England and Wales, as far as the Catholic schools were concerned, the very work which the French Prime Minister had been doing to the Catholic schools and convents in France. He at least stood in the House of Commons as one Irish Catholic representative to protest against any such conduct, and to record his objection to the doctrine wrongfully put forward by the hon. Member for East Mayo on the part of Irish Catholics.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE thought the hon. Member for South Leitrim had been shooting at a distant target rather than directing his fire at the Amendment before the House.

*MR. TULLY: It was only a sighting shot.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that when the hon. Member produced a list of the thirty Roman Catholic schools that were likely to be closed by the operation of this Amendment, the House would be able to see what grievance they possessed. Under this Bill almost the entire cost of the schools in question was to be paid out of rates and taxes, and surely under the exceptional circumstances contemplated by the Amendment—even in the exceptional circumstances of the thirty somewhat mythical schools referred to by the hon. Member for South Leitrim —the State was entitled to insist on certain conditions before it spent so large a sum of money. The grievance this Amendment was designed to meet was admitted. It was one of the weightiest grievances that existed, and it would be one of the greatest practical difficulties in the working of the Act. The Clauses placed on the Paper to meet the difficulty had been shut cut by the Closure, but the present Amendment appeared to raise the point, and to do so without the difficulty of interpretation involved in certain previous Amendments. This was always called a question of "single school" parishes, but it was nothing of the kind. A very common case, indeed, was that of a single civil or ecclesiastical parish—the latter sometimes containing two civil parishes—in which there were four or five schools, but all under the same body of managers, and therefore, for all practical purposes, one; they were all Church of England schools. Things would be worse under the Bill, because in many of these parishes the trust deeds were not strictly adhered to, and in order to obtain subscriptions from the whole population, and especially from the manufacturing portion, Nonconformist managers were appointed. But under the Bill the conditions of the trust would be rigidly adhered to; and these Nonconformist managers would not be appointed, and the system which now might, and sometimes did, work very fairly, would not continue. The Amendment raised the whole question, because the word "areas" would probably be interpreted as meaning the areas served by the particular schools. He regretted the tone adopted by the Secretary to the Board of Education on the present occasion. Previously, when the matter had been discussed, they had, at all events, been met sympathetically, with promises that the matter should be considered, and everything done that could be done to meet this admitted grievance. But today the hon. Member had directed a heavy fire into the Amendment saying that things were working with perfect harmony, and that it was a matter of which much was heard in the House of Commons, but very little in the districts themselves. The reason little was heard in the districts was that the grievance existed mainly in the few parishes where extreme teaching was given. But that was not the case he was putting to the House. His case was that of places where things worked well at present, because the schools were conducted in such a way as to draw subscriptions from the whole neighbourhood. If this Bill were passed, all that harmony would cease, and much would be heard of the grievance—not from the exceptional parishes in which the teaching was disapproved, but from all the parishes in which these so-called single schools existed.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) was sure that some of his friends on the Government side of the House would not agree with the taunt levelled by the right hon. Baronet at the hon. Member for South Leitrim, who had, as he humorously said, "fired a sighting shot" into those Members who were away, but who ought to have been sitting on the Benches opposite. Church members at least must have considerable sympathy with the hon. Member. It was not a very dignified position for Members of the House of Commons to be away in America, or elsewhere, looking for the wherewithal to carry on the agitation for Home Rule, while they left the true teaching of their Church to look after itself in Parliament. The Irish people at heart were a most religious people. They were Roman Catholics, but they of the Church of England thought none the worse of them for that; they respected them for it. And yet, at a time when their teachers and their schools were in jeopardy, or would have been but for the large majority on the Government side of the House, nearly eighty Members had forsaken their flocks and fled to America or other places. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the

Member for East Wolverhampton was one of the most moderate from that side of the House to which he had listened for a long time. But with regard to the Devonshire case quoted by the right hon. Gentleman, it should be for the bishop to censure that clergyman, as censured, indeed, he ought to be. As many on the Government side objected to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment because it placed the religious teaching under the control of the managers instead of the clergyman, and ultimately the bishop, so he would object also to this Amendment because it took from the bishop the power and responsibility which he ought to have of censuring clergymen who behaved in the manner described by the right hon. Gentleman. He wished he could feel that popular control would provide a solution of the difficulty in these one-school areas. He was afraid, however, that that was not possible, because the word "weapon" used by the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs on the previous day still rang in their ears. The hon. Member had frankly stated that in the districts in which there was a war between two creeds, and the Nonconformists got the better of it, they would use their advantage as a weapon against the Church in these one-school districts.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) explained that what he said was that if the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich were carried, Nonconformists would certainly use that weapon, unless popular control were given.

Mr. MALCOLM said that if popular control were given, Nonconformists would have a greater weapon given to them, and a weapon would be taken from the Church. If the Amendment of his noble friend had been accepted, a weapon of equal sharpness would have been given to both parties, but with great astuteness the hon. Member for Dewsbury now proposed to give to his own side a weapon which he withheld from the other. It was really a measure for the confiscation of Church schools in these areas, and as such he should vote against it.

Mr. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) thought the Government ought really to be grateful to the Opposition for providing them with a suggestion as to what should be done in this matter. From the First Lord of the Treasury to so advanced a Member as the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, all admitted that in these single-school areas Nonconformists had a very considerable grievance, and yet all the Government would say was that they would give them nothing except Clauses 9 and 10. He should certainly support the Amendment What he suggested in a new Clause which he had upon the Paper was that the local electors should be allowed to decide every three years whether the school should be taken over by the local authority or not. That was a comparatively moderate thing. It would have done away with this grievance at once in some cases, and later on in other instances. At any rate, the people would have felt that they had a right to have a poll to decide the question. The Government simply presented a *non possumus* upon this question. He believed that a large number of country clergymen would be willing to accept such a proposal as he put down on the Paper, or of the kind which had been moved by the hon. Member for Dewsbury, but they would not give up the management of those schools, because at the diocesan meetings the clergymen who gave up their schools lost caste. On the principles of justice he should certainly support the Amendment.

Colonel PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said that perhaps the grievance which had been alluded to was the greatest that the Nonconformists felt. The Government had already considered it very carefully, but had they considered it enough? Was it not possible, even at the eleventh hour, to remedy this grievance? He desired that this Bill should work well in the country, and as far as the Church of England was concerned he believed it would be far better that this position should be fully and justly met by some arrangement in regard to these one-school areas. It seemed to him that it would be in the interests of the Church of England that this should be done. It would be far better instead of building another school to make some arrangement by which the management of the Church of England religious teaching should be in such a position that Nonconformists would feel that they could send their children there and be in no way interfered with as regarded their religion. In his Division this grievance did not arise, for it was not felt to the same extent in populous towns. It only arose where the population was just sufficient for one school. He knew that this was not an easy position to meet, but he thought it could be met, and if it was too late to deal with it in this House, the Government had a sufficient power and following in another place to see that a suitable and proper way of dealing with the question was introduced into the Bill. He thought that if the Church of England would open their schools more widely and generously and fearlessly, they would make converts by thousands. He spoke as a Nonconformist who had liberally supported Church of England schools in Lancashire. Did they suppose that he would ever let go his interest in the National Church? It was because he believed that an alteration of the Bill in this direction would not only be in the interests of the smooth working of the Bill, but would also redound to the interest and benefit of the Church of England, that he made this appeal to the Government.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) assured the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education that this was felt to be a very considerable grievance in rural parishes. He happened to represent a constituency in which there were a large number of parishes with single-school areas, and in many of those parishes there was a majority of Nonconformists. It rankled with them when anything cropped up relating to their schools, and he was perfectly certain it would be to the real and abiding interest of the Church of England if it would throw open its doors and admit a majority of managers on the management for those schools where only one school existed for children to attend. The Secretary to the Board of Education had told the House that this was largely a local grievance. He did not believe it. Of course the right hon. Gentleman was not brought so closely in touch with the electorate as most hon. Members. There were scores of villages in his constituency where this grievance was keenly felt. He should be only too delighted to chaperone the right hon. Gentleman through his constituency, where he would find this grievance was very severely felt. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Nonconformists in the country parishes were a peaceable race. Naturally they were, because they occupied a rather subordinate position. Very often they were small shopkeepers or labourers, and could not afford to be obstreperous and continually making complaints against the school. In the great majority of cases the rectors and squires were reasonable men, and would not attempt to persecute a man because he expressed his religious convictions; but what could be said of such a rector as he mentioned the other day, who considered a gardener incompetent because he was a Nonconformist? This illustrated the case in Devon of the vicar who compelled the children to say some of them wanted the Bible and some did not. These were the things which the Nonconformists considered grievances, and they would not exist if a majority of the managers were appointed by the local authorities. As a compromise, he would be quite content with the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, and allow two managers to be appointed by the Parish Council, two by the County Council, and two by the denomination. That would be a very fair compromise in the country parishes. It might be said that the denomination would suffer a little. He doubted it. Anyhow, it was not so important that the denomination should not suffer as it was that national education should not suffer. He put education far above denomination, and if it were a question between the two, the former should triumph. It was absurd to call the Bill an Education Bill if they allowed the interests of the denomination to override the real interests of education. It was all very well for the right hon. Gentleman to talk about the difficulty. The Government was there to meet the difficulty. What difficulty did the Bill really meet except the difficulty of maintaining voluntary schools? What they asked was that in those parishes where there was a large number of Nonconformists, compelled by law to send their children to single schools, that they should be given a majority of the representation on the board of management. The grievance would be brought home tenfold when the rate-collector went round, and he hoped at this eleventh hour the Government would do something to meet this grievance in the country districts.

(5.0.) MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he felt that this Amendment could be looked upon as standing by itself. There was no idea of confiscation. All that was desired by some of them on both sides of the House was that there should be some recognition of the exceptional position and circumstances in which the schools in these parishes were placed. By giving even one elected representative, he believed the position of the schools in those parishes would be strengthened. They could not pretend but to feel that in the removal of the subscribers there had been a removal of a great force, which had been for good, in these parishes. They knew that the subscriptions were collected from all alike, not merely from church or chapel people—they had been collected from those who wished to support the present schools, and possibly from those who supported them merely to avoid having a school rate. He felt that the plan of the Amendment was much better than that which was suggested in the Bill, namely, the building of a second school. In the interests of education, how could they expect the success of a rival school in a small parish which was only able to support one school properly managed? He expressed the hope that there would be some recognition of the exceptional circumstances, and he was sure the result would amply repay the concession.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that every time the single-school area was mentioned, they were all agreed that there was a serious grievance. That had been universally admitted, and there had been nothing said to the contrary. An equally striking feature was the fact that the Government could find no remedy. The Prime Minister had again and again admitted the grievance. He had heard this Government called "a Government of all the talents." He thought they might have done more for the grievance of the single-school areas. The issue before the House now was whether they should co tinue to compel people to send their children to a school, the religious instruction in which would be distasteful to them. The Parliamentary Secretary said that the Government had given Clauses 9, 10, and 11 of the Bill. He would ask the hon. Baronet whether he thought that the provisions of those Clauses really constituted a mitigation of this difficulty. What was the scheme set forth in those Clauses? If people were discontented with the form of religious instruction given in a village school, they were to have the right of applying for another school; then the managers of the existing school might put in a notice of objection; then the ratepayers might object, and the whole matter would go to the Board of Education to inquire whether those who were applying for a separate school were to have one. The Board of Education were to have regard to the interests of secular education and the wishes of the people, and they were to have regard to the economy of the rates. He was quite sure that the application for another school would be rejected. This remedy was quite illusory, and he was very glad it was. He could not view with satisfaction the prospect of setting up these little mushroom schools, which would be largely extravagant and educationally absurd. He did think that it was in the Government's interest to endeavour to do something. He was one of those who were anxious for the harmonious working of the Bill in the localities. He believed it would have a very rough time in many of the localities. If something could be done here, it should be done to remove the difficulties which would be felt in many cases. There was not a great deal of trouble at present in many of the villages. The teachers had been very discreet, and in the Church schools they had not pushed the thing too far in dealing with Nonconformist children. The parents themselves had been—he thought he might say without offence—fairly indifferent. Why? Not because they were not concerned with religious instruction. He was sure the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich would agree with him in that. It was because the whole cost had come from some place far away—the Treasury. There was a school in the place, and it was to them a dispensation of

Providence, like the weather—something with which they had no personal connection. But they were now going to the doors of the people with a demand-note, asking five, ten, fifteen, or twenty shillings. That was the way to create an interest in the schools on the part of those good people who had been unconcerned, and who in the past had not contributed a farthing. He knew that there were nearly a thousand villages in which there were no voluntary contributions at all. They had been living on the Government grants. The interest of those people in the conduct of the schools would be increased manyfold at once by the mere demand for money. The voluntary school teachers in the single-school areas were going to have a rough time of it. Could the Government do nothing to mitigate that? He suggested, in the interest of the working of the Bill, that something should be done to mitigate it—something beyond the appointment of a subordinate teacher. Someone had suggested that they were proposing confiscation. He did not propose confiscation at all. He wanted to treat everybody fairly and reasonably. The proposal which the hon. Member for East Mayo made was one which the Government might very well have accepted, namely, that where there was one school the six managers should consist of two representing the parents, two the public, and two the trust. The Prime Minister said he felt that might upset the denominational character of the school, and that was the ground taken now. If the denominational character of the school was upset, at whose instance would it be done? The parents of the children. They would be the moderating influence, and hon. Members opposite had always said that they ought to have the claim to determine the religious instruction to be given in the school. He still hoped that the Government might see its way to do something. If the character of the school was to be changed, it could only be done at the instance of those who had a right to change it. If nothing was done here, perhaps in another place something might be done. He was sure that in villages where there was only one school, and that a denominational school, to which people were compelled to send their children, there would be interminable difficulties, unless some provisions were made to meet the grievance. He urged that such steps should be taken as would give the parents in those villages a predominating influence in the management of the schools.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said it was quite clear that the remedy proposed now was no remedy at all. Either it would make no difference, in which case the Nonconformists would have as much ground of complaint as before, or it would make a difference, in which case the Church parents would have a grievance. The representation of the parents suggested by the hon. Member for North Camberwell did not correspond at all with the inalienable right of parents. The inalienable right of parents was only over their own children. No parent had rights over other people's children. Therefore, under this proposal, they would shift the grievance from one set to another. There were two kinds of religious opinion, and only one school to go to. There must be a grievance one way or another. The one idea which was constantly cropping up, no matter how often it was dealt with, was that undenominational teaching ought to be acceptable to the members of the Church of England, even if it were not so. That was the question which they had over and over again. It was the very prevalence of that idea which they had now once more presented to them, that they should accept undenominational teaching, which furnished a very great difficulty in the solution of this question. Once the idea was thoroughly understood, he thought that the Scotch system would work very well indeed in this country.

*Mr. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said that the noble Lord was confounding two entirely different things. There could be no doubt that what was at the bottom of the education policy of the Church was an attempt, a desire, to drive the children of Nonconformist parents into denominational schools, deliberately for the purpose of turning them into members of the Church. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] Well, a man must be supposed to see the reasonable results of the acts which he committed. What was the ground on which the Church party supported the denominational schools at such a sacrifice? Why were they championed as being necessary to satisfy the conscience of Churchmen? It was openly stated that it was because they had a tendency to turn the children into Churchpeople. The Church party claimed that it was in their eyes a conscientious duty to secure an education for the children of Churchpeople which would have that effect. When that is the reason which is put forward the first thing an honest man should say was that he would never be a party to driving into such a school the children of parents of other denominations. How could they make the provision of an education tending to lead the children to become members of the Church a question of conscience and yet lift one finger to support a permanent system of education which used those schools by the force of law for the children of those who did not hold the same religious views.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that the hon. and learned Member was making a most unfair representation of his views. The danger of which the hon. Member spoke was merely imaginary. The Clause which he had proposed on the previous day was totally opposed to the suggestion of the hon. Member.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON said that even with the noble Lord's Amendment of the preceding day it was intended that the schools should remain denominational schools—schools with the two doors. He did not say that the noble Lord personally desired to take the children of Nonconformist parents and force them into Church schools, but the noble Lord was supporting a Bill which made such a practice part of the permanent system of education in England. Various means had been tried to avert the injustice, but they had all utterly failed, because the cry of confiscation had been raised. In other words, it was a question of property and money which was to justify this gross injustice which placed a lien upon the religious education of the children regardless of the wishes of the parents. He admitted that hon. Gentlemen opposite were anxious that the children should be trained up in Church principles. That was a very good motive for voluntary educational effort. But if it was important that children should have an education tending positively to make them follow their parents in the choice of a denomination it was ten times more important that they should not be forced into schools purposely organised so as to lead them to leave the denomination to which their parents belonged. No one who put himself into a judicial position and weigh the two against one another could fail to see that the Nonconformist grievance was greater than that of the Churchman. Were they going to allow this Bill to go out to the country with the knowledge which the country would have that the Nonconformist conscientious grievances had not been remedied one iota? [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] Look at the ninth and tenth Clauses, which, in his humble opinion, were the most iniquitous Clauses in the Bill. They took from the local authority even the power of deciding that a provided school was necessary. It appeared to him that a remedy might be found for those grievances which would go far to remove the sense of wrong from the minds of Nonconformists, but if they left the crying injustice untouched, an amount of strife would accompany the Bill which would tend to paralyse the work of education.

*MR. TALBOT said he wished to repel, in a very few sentences, the charges made by the hon. and learned Gentleman. To say that no attempt had been made to remedy the wrongs of Nonconformists was really a gross perversion of what had been done. Only yesterday he and his friends had tried to meet these alleged grievances, but their attempt obtained no support from the Opposition. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that the grievance of the Nonconformist was not comparable to the grievance of the Church. He should have thought that the hon. Gentleman would have realised that a negation was just as much a grievance to the conscience as an affirmation. It was just as much a grievance to Churchmen that there should be a negation of the great doctrines of the faith in which they believed, as to Nonconformists that doctrines in which they did not believe should be taught.

(5.30.) MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) denied that there was any negation of the doctrines of the Church in the board schools. Only the religious truth of Christianity as professed by the Church of England or the Nonconformists could be taught in the board schools. Nonconformists might not believe in the ritual of the Church of England, but there was not a single doctrine in which the right hon Gentleman believed which he did not believe in himself. It was not in itself a direct negation, though it might be a difference in form. The schools should be cleared from this religious controversy altogether. The money to maintain them was to be paid by men of most diverse religious opinions, and they were all agreed that the children should be educated as citizens of this great industrial country. Why should they have this eternal clash of creeds?

MR. MALCOLM: This is a great religious country as well as a great industrial country.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he was aware of that. He believed in these doctrines as solemnly as the hon. Member did Public money should not be devoted to religious controversy, and that was sure to be the outcome of this Bill. There was a larger Nonconformist conscience outside of the House, so far as this Bill was concerned than hon. Members gave credit for, and he believed that instead of helping to forward the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England this Bill would help its disruption, and would do great evil to denominational teaching in the land.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he should be sorry to see this Bill law without some serious attempt to redress the legitimate grievance of Nonconformists in the single-school rural areas. He had before he entered this House read with amazement the proposition of the hon. Member for East Mayo, which was a most surprising one to come from a Roman Catholic. He could not see how Roman Catholics could be affected by this Bill, for he certainly was not prepared to give Roman Catholic schools preferential treatment. He thought there was an agreement on both sides of the House that the Government should, if possible, find some remedy. But the remedy proposed by the hon. Member who moved this Amendment was one which he could not support. There were in the English parishes about 7,500 schools, of which 5,600 were Church of England schools, 1,800 board schools, and the balance voluntary schools of some other character. He should have thought that, if there was to be any differential treatment as between town and country, it was only fair that the whole of the schools in the rural areas should have been dealt with. But the hon. Member only proposed that these 5,600 schools belonging to the Church of England should be placed exactly in the position of the board schools of to-day. But the Amendment would place all these Church schools in the position of provided schools, and to that proposition he could not be a party. Hon. Gentlemen opposite could not seriously advance this Amendment as a solution of this difficulty, so that the position was that while everyone admitted the existence of a grievance, no one had yet come forward with a practical remedy which would commend itself to both sides of the House. He did not believe that the religious teaching in the board schools was repugnant to the majority of Churchmen. If it was not too late, he would now suggest to the Government that the parents should be given some representation in the management of the rural schools, while the foundation managers were not diminished. He was not prepared to move the suggestion as an Amendment at a moment's notice, but such a thing might be done by increasing the number of the managers to seven, four of whom should be foundation managers, one a representative of the local authority, and the other two direct representatives of the parents. He thought such a scheme would be an improvement on the present position, but while he desired the parents to be in a position to express their wishes, he was not prepared to give them the right to take away the property of the Church of England.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the right of control was the only solution for this difficulty, and although the hon.

Gentleman who had just sat down complained that no one had offered any practical remedy for the mitigation of this grievance, the hon. Member for East Mayo suggested exactly the same remedy as the hon. Member himself had just put forward. That suggestion, however, was not accepted. It was a most remarkable fact that although every speaker on both sides of the House had admitted that the grievance existed, it was only from the Opposition that any attempts at a solution of the difficulty had come, until they had this suggestion from the hon. Member, which he would be glad to adopt. How would the Amendment inflict any grievance on Churchmen? It proposed to make these single school areas provided schools, and then to give every facility to the Church for teaching its own doctrines to its own children. It was in fact the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, but with control. It was not true to say that the Nonconformists had rejected any practical solution of the difficulty.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he could not allow this debate to come to an end without contradicting the statement of the hon. Member opposite that no suggestion for the solution of this difficulty had come from the Government side of the House. He had himself placed a Clause on the Paper which would have given control. It would have made it the duty of the local authority to make arrangements by which the religious instruction acceptable to the parents should be given. That was done in hundreds and thousands of schools now. Hon. Members opposite would lead one to suppose that the schools were the scene of perpetual religious squabbles. But there was not one in a thousand where there was any trouble at all. The agitation raised in Parliament and on the platform was unknown in the rural areas, because the people in the rural districts came together and discussed matters, and as a rule the managers managed to give such instruction that no child was ever withdrawn. As a matter of fact, he attributed the reluctance of Parliament to settle this question to the fact that the religious controversy was a very useful weapon in matters of this sort.

*(6.0.) MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury) said he knew of cases where such voluntary arrangements as the hon. Member for Cambridge University referred to were in operation; and that that which had been given to the people by voluntary arrangement ought not to be swept away, as it would be by the Bill, but converted into a statutory right. He instanced the case of Salisbury School, near Blackburn, in which such a scheme as was mentioned had been arranged, and had worked without the slightest friction. The Committee consisted of the vicar and six members elected by the three parishes served by the school. Upon the arrangement being made, the teaching of the Catechism was discontinued, but the vicar gave instruction at stated times to all who desired it in the vestry of the church. Hon. Members opposite frequently spoke as if they only represented the wishes of the parents. How were they expressed in the case of this school? Not one parent asked that the teaching of the Catechism should be retained in the school. After ten years' experience of the scheme, the vicar had quite as many candidates for confirmation, and the religious life of the district was quite as good as before. The diocesan inspector had reported that the school deserved to be classed as "excellent;" that none of the subjects were below "very good;" that most of them were "excellent;" that the spirit of reverence pervading the whole school was very marked, and that the repetition and recitation of the prayers was excellent and most reverent; while the Bishop of Manchester, who visited the school three years ago, had remarked that he had visited every school in the diocese, but had never seen more reverence in prayer. This was in a school which was managed by six elected managers and the clergyman. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich seemed not to recognise that there was among Christians what might be called a common denominator—something which could be agreed upon to be taught to all the children in the schools. The remarks of the hon. Member for East Toxteth were an evidence of that fact, and also of the feeling of those Members who had most recently been in contact with the constituencies. In view of recent elections, it was rather amusing

to hear the hon. Member saying that the more the matter was considered the more remote was the prospect of a Liberal Government. The experience of the hon. Member himself showed that the feeling of the constituencies was not so much in favour of every detail of the Bill as the Government desired to think, and the hon. Member would achieve a great success if only he could induce the Government to accept his views with reference to the Amendment under discussion. The Amendment referred not solely to Church of England schools, but to all schools, and the mover would doubtless be prepared to accept any reasonable scheme which would carry out either his own plan or that recently suggested by the hon. Member for East Mayo. He was suprised at the remarks which had been made as to the speech of the Member for East Mayo, in moving his Amendment relating to this question. It appeared to him to be a perfectly honest recognition of an undoubted grievance. In reply to the declaration of the hon. Member for Oxford University that the denominational schools had been there, were there, and would continue, he would say that the Opposition had demanded, did demand, and would continue to demand, a publicly managed school within reach of every parent who desired to make use of it. Strong and admirable in its wayas was the desire to maintain denominational schools, hon Members would find that there was on the other side quite as strong a determination that the children of other denominations should not be forced into those schools. As for popular control, hon. Members opposite always took it for granted that an elected majority would be hostile to the Church. He thought that an absolutely mistaken notion. The influence of the clergy and the people of the Church of England would have its due effect, and probably in most cases the Church would obtain a majority on the committee. The Opposition did not ask for a statutory right for Nonconformists to be on the Committee; they were willing to accept the result of an appeal to the people, and stood on the principle of public representation. They asked that they might have a constituency to which they could appeal when there was any grievance. Let them have that, and they would rely on the general sense of fairness which was always to be found in their countrymen.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said he had studied the Bill as carefully as a layman could, and so far as he understood the matter the position was this: In a parish with a large majority of Church-people the school would be conducted in accordance with the tenets of the Church of England, and would be thoroughly efficient in that respect. Parenthetically, he might say that he thought it impossible to erect a school to please everybody. If a Jew lived among a large number of Christians, or a Mohammedan amongst Buddhists, he had occasionally to suffer certain disabilities. In the same way, if two or three Dissenters lived in such a parish as he had described, although the Church-people would doubtless try to make things as easy as possible for them, he was afraid they would have to suffer certain disabilities, and their children would have to go to that school, although they might be withdrawn from the religious instruction. But what would happen in a parish in which there was a Church school, and a large majority of the people were Nonconformists? If the managers provided an education which was not in accordance with the wishes of the parents, the latter would doubtless be very indignant. They would probably send a petition to the local authority, who would look into the matter, and no doubt give the parents favourable hearing. ["No!"] The Council would then go to the Board of Education and say a new school must be provided. He did not believe that any Minister at the Board of Education would refuse the demand of the County Council if a large majority of the parents required a different kind of education. The Council would then say to the managers: "You are not giving the kind of education the parents desire, and we intend to build a new school," and the managers, probably being the biggest ratepayers in the parishes, would, in nine cases out of ten, immediately reply: "If the parents do not approve of the education which is being given, we will let you our school; you take it over and manage it." That would be done in nine cases out of ten, and he thought this difficulty would be got over. Then there was the Churchman who was anxious that his child should receive religious education every morning. He would have a grievance. But if he lived amongst a lot of people who were mostly Nonconformists he would have to bear the grievance, because it was perfectly impossible to please everybody. Where voluntary schools were under management which suited the people of the district, they had nothing to say against them, and such schools would go on quietly. In his own constituency there was a large number of Nonconformists, who had no quarrel with the Church schools, and in many cases Nonconformists were the managers of those schools, and even the churchwardens were often Nonconformists. Undoubtedly the managers would see that Nonconformists were represented on the board of management. As he read the Bill, he thought all educational interests were protected, and they would not serve any useful purpose by passing fresh Amendments.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he did not think it was necessary for him to quarrel with the noble Lord who had just spoken, because they always listened to his speeches with considerable interest. He thought there was a good deal of practical common-sense in what the noble Lord had said. The policy underlying this Bill aimed at maintaining the voluntary schools of this country, and it was impossible for them to think that the Bill would work out in any other direction. As one who represented a large area in Wales, this Amendment was bound to have a great influence on the constituency he represented. The case complained of was an acute one in Wales, where the majority of elementary schools were denominational schools. At least one half of the elementary schools were denominational schools, and a great majority of them were single schools in their area. There had been many evidences during the discussion that both sides admitted this grievance and desired, if possible, to meet it. He was very sorry that any theological dispute had been brought in. He felt that there was a great gulf fixed between a certain number of hon. Members opposite, who held religious views which it was difficult to bridge over as between them and those who sat on the Opposition side. Those differences, however, would not be settled by a debate in the House of Commons, but only by the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the country as a whole. The result of the attitude of the Government in reference to the Amendment would be that the process of extinction of non-provided schools would go on all the more quickly. He should have thought that in the interests of the satisfactory working of this Bill, and in the higher interests of education, the Government would have reconsidered the possibility of doing something in the direction of this Amendment. He was very glad to hear the speech of the hon. Member for East Toxteth, who expressed views which were largely held by the Church, and whose intervention in the debate to-day was welcomed from both sides of the House. He hoped it was not yet too late for the Government in another place to do something to meet this real grievance.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said he rose to ask the Government very seriously to reconsider this matter. He had not before spoken in any of the debates on the Education Bill, and perhaps his position was a somewhat peculiar one. He was a friend of this Bill on the whole. He had voted for a good many Amendments, but they might vote for Amendments from quite different motives. Some hon. Members might vote for Amendments because they wished to wreck a Bill, but he voted for Amendments with the intention of improving this Bill. He felt that this was a better Bill than they had any chance of getting from any one else, and he was disposed to take this Bill rather than see the great cause of education put back for ten or twenty years. His desire was to make this Bill as good as it possibly could be made, and to make it work as smoothly and as effectively as possible when it was passed. He wanted to put it to the Government, as a Churchman who was very keenly interested in the welfare of the Church, whether there was not a case of grave injustice that ought to be met in this particular matter. He asked the Government to consider how they would feel themselves, as Churchmen, if they were in the minority in which

Nonconformists were. They must not forget that the great principle of compulsion had been introduced in education. When this country adopted the great principle of legal compulsion, they altered the whole philosophy of the matter. Now they found that in thousands of parishes the children were compelled by law to go to the only school in the district. How would they, as Churchmen, like it if they were compelled to send their children to Roman Catholic schools? He thought his hon. friend opposite had a little under estimated what was called the religious atmosphere. How would they like it if their children had to go to schools soaked with a Roman Catholic atmosphere? They would feel that it was a case of great injustice, and they ought to feel that, in a Bill which was going to put this education question on a new footing for generations to come, there ought not to be anything that would create a sense of injustice. This was certainly a great and practical injustice. He had not risen to suggest a remedy, but he begged the Secretary to the Board of Education, as a Churchman, and as a friend of this Bill and a friend of education, to do something to meet this practical injustice, which would do more than anything else to impede the effective working of this Bill. He was convinced that the Church of England did not need for its strength and maintenance any kind of chicanery. On the contrary, he was certain that the true welfare of the Church was identified with moderation, liberality, and generosity in a matter of this kind. Upon the School Boards in nearly every case at the elections Churchmen were returned in a majority which showed that the masses were in favour of the Church. He hoped the Government would do something to meet this difficulty.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he lived in the centre of a number of parishes which were single-school areas. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had told them that there was no real grievance. This grievance might not be very loudly expressed, but nevertheless it was felt very keenly and bitterly. He agreed that if the Bill passed into law in its present form it would pass with a very serious and great blot upon it in this respect. Appeals had been made to the Secretary to the Board of Education. He did not wish to say anything offensive, but he thought it was unfortunate for the educational system of this country that the hon. Gentleman should represent in this House a constituency which consisted very largely of rural clergymen. He hoped that before the Bill left this House something might be done to mitigate its acerbity to Nonconformists in this respect. This Bill was to go to another place, and what mercy were Nonconformists' interests likely to meet with in another place, which did not contain a single English or Welsh Nonconformist, but which did contain a large number of the official representatives of the Church of England? The grievance, to which reference had constantly been made, had been acknowledged by the Prime Minister and his predecessor, Lord Salisbury, and it was one which was not to be lightly settled in this country. He wished to express his belief that this Bill would be very largely unworkable in many of the country districts of England. They could not treat large areas with large majorities of Nonconformists as if they were children or slaves always to be kept in subjection. These people had the feelings of human beings. He ventured to say with regard to these large areas of the country that a feeling was arising, and would continue to grow after the passage of the Bill, which would never cease until ultimately some fairer solution than this could be found. He wished to do everything that could be done to meet the views of honest Churchmen in this matter. He did not wish to see a victory of Nonconformists over Churchmen. He did not wish to see this question settled on the basis of keeping the other side always down to the ground. He trusted that when another Bill was introduced into the House the Government of the day, whatever that Government might be, would take into consideration all the factors that applied to the situation in an infinitely fairer manner than had been done in the case of this Bill.

(6.33). Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 117; Noes, 209. (Division List No. 584.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ellis, John Edward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J. A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley

Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,F'versham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon.Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn. WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett. Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell,W.J H(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn.M. W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliam H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb,Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton)
Welby,SirCharlesG E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*(6.44.) MR. RICKETT (Scarborough) moved an Amendment on Clause 6 with the object of providing that of the six managers four should be representative and two foundation managers. It was quite useless at this time of day to argue the question of abstract right, and he would, therefore, confine himself to endeavouring to impress on hon. Gentlemen opposite, in the interest of the Church party, how desirable it would be to recognise the representative character of these schools. There was no point in the whole Bill which stood so outside the theological sphere, and which would so appeal to that large part of the English people —48 to 52 per cent. of the population—who did not attend any church, and who, as working men, would largely determine the fate of this Bill and the fate of the next election. They were very weary of these theological discussions. They quite realised that Church and Nonconformity appeared to bulk more largely in the House than they did in the country. They had a keen sense that where the money went, particularly in the case of rates, there should be a true representation of those who provided the money—that they should not be put in the position of mere spectators. They had been told that the local education authority would have the disbursement of the money. That might be so, but the working classes realised the common-sense view of the situation that the management of the school would be practically in the hands of the Board of Managers. If, as they had been told, the real control was vested in the hands of the local education authority, then why put two representative members on the Board of Management. For what purpose were these two members put on the Board? Surely it must be that it was felt with the introduction of rates some sort of control would be exercised through the Board. If that

were not so, the only alternative would be that these two representatives would stand for the religious side of the management, and that would be contrary to the intentions of the Government and the wishes of the Church party. Where there was a majority of foundation managers there would be constant controversy going on. Moreover, the Liberal Government of the future might hesitate to reverse legislation, but could easily convert two into four by a short Act. The Church school was secured for denominational purposes by the Trust, and so long as the Trust Deed was maintained there would be no risk in increasing the number of representative members of the Committee, as no change could take place in the denominational character of the school. If this change were made, the representative managers would become friends instead of critics, or in the position of the Devil's Advocate. If the Government made this concession it would not involve the least sacrifice of the denominational position of the school, but would, in his opinion, do more than anything else to confirm that denominational status, and leave it unchallenged in the future. Moreover, those who desired that the clergy should have a strong position in the management would secure that by reducing the foundation managers from four to two. The influence which denominationalism would exert in the schools in the future would be a moral, and not a mechanical and physical one. The moral position would he strengthened by his proposal. It seemed to him that that was a very strong case for making the alteration he proposed in the representative managers, and that it was far more likely to work in harmony with the denominational managers than if the representative managers were in a minority. What was the Church to gain by this capricious and anomalous position of the Church schools ? Would she not gain a great deal more by frankly holding out her hand to the people, by throwing open her gates and making herself in fact, as she desired to be in theory, the Church of the nation ?

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'four,' and insert the word 'two.'"—(*Mr. Compton Rickett.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'four' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said he wished to make a last appeal to the Government to alter the Bill on this very vital point before it became law. He made that appeal to the Prime Minister, not from any religious point of view, or from even any educational point of view, for he did not profess to be an educational authority. But the right hon. Gentleman must be anxious that this Bill should work in practice, and, as a Member of a County Council, it was his belief that if this provision was left in its present form in the Bill, giving the denominational managers a majority on the Board, the Bill would not work satisfactorily and harmoniously in the way which he was sure the right hon. Gentleman desired. The point on which he laid special stress was that of economy. There would be handed over to the managers, through the local authority, immense sums of money. Take the case of his own county. They should have, what with the old aid grant, the new aid grant and the money raised by the threepenny rate, £100,000, and he ventured to say that where the local education authority had not the full control of the administration of this huge sum of money there could be no hope or prospect of the Bill being administered efficiently or economically. The Committee of Management would have no inducement to practise economy. An education inspector would come down to inspect the school, and the managing Committee would persuade him that new desks and new books, &c., were wanted, and the inspectors would recommend that these should be furnished. The local authority would have no power to stay the hand of an extravagant school management committee. The right hon. the Prime Minister, would see that this proposal of his hon. friend went to the root of the Bill. He believed that the Opposition as a whole had disinterestedly applied themselves to improve the Bill, and at the eleventh hour they were making a final appeal to the Government to reconsider their decision, and let the Bill pass as a more workable measure.

*(7.0.) Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the Government ought to be grateful to

the hon. Members who had just spoken for the most kindly solicitude they had shown for the future of the Church and of the Bill and of the Government. But they must bear in mind that these schools were to be denominational schools. That was part of the scheme of the Bill, and many hon. Members opposite had said they did not desire to deprive these schools of their denominational character. How could they provide for the maintenance of the denominational character of the schools if the denominational managers were not in the majority? The hon. Member for Scarborough had said that the members of the board of managers, coming from different sources of representation, would be engaged in constant controversy, because they represented different interests, and there would be constant litigation. He ventured to predict the hon. Gentleman had taken an exaggerated view of the situation. He had himself been connected with a body concerned in the management of a school of which the various members of the governing body came from different constituencies, but it never appeared to him that each representative considered it was his business to assert the views of the constituency he represented. All were engaged in endeavouring to advance the institution of which they had the control. He was convinced when these managers came together under this Bill they would forget that one was a foundation manager and the others were not, and all would work together harmoniously. The real reason for insisting that there should be a majority of denominational managers was to insure that the teachers should be chosen with due regard to their denominational character. If they were to choose people who were to teach religion of a practical sort they must be sure that the people chosen would be able conscientiously to teach that which they had to teach. That was an unanswerable reason for insisting on this majority on the board of management, and he saw no other way in which could be secured the end which everybody admitted was desirable, namely, that the schools should remain denominational schools.

MR. BRYCE said the gratitude of the Secretary to the Board of Education to his hon. friends had stopped at words, and had not taken the shape of any concession. He did not even take the excellent advice offered; he made no answer to them, except that the schools referred to must be denominational. Since the discussion of this question in July, the Government had discovered no fresh argument. The Opposition had discovered, in the course of the Bill, many additional reasons for anticipating that it would work badly in its present form. All that the hon. Gentleman now said had been said in July last. To the denominational considera tion everything was to be sacrificed: strife was to be introduced, good administration to be lost, and constitutional principles to be disregarded. He maintained that, with a trust deed securing the denominational character of the school, the necessity for a majority of denominational managers disappeared. The local authorities would be bound to respect the trust. This had been referred to as the eleventh hour of the Bill. This was the last chance the Government had of making changes which would, he did not say remove their objections to the Bill—they had long ceased to hope for that—but give the measure a reasonable chance of being accepted by the House as one that it would be possible to work. Well, the eleventh hour was passing, and that chance was being lost. In resisting the Amendment the Government were making fatal errors. They were violating the principle, hitherto always observed, that taxation and control should go together, in defiance of a challenge to point out any precedent for such a course. They were not giving the spending authority the strong connection they ought to have with the representative local authority, but were putting on the managing body a majority who would have no interest in economy. Their argument, which was not met by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Board of Education, was that they were putting the managers into a position in which it would be necessary for them to incur expense with the passive consent, or in anticipation of the consent, of the local authority, and therefore there ought to be on the managing body a majority of persons appointed from the local authority. They were creating a further source of theological strife, and losing the opportunity now given to them of avoiding that strife by having on the spot an authority impartial, trusted, representative, and responsible. Nothing would meet their sense of injustice but the provision everywhere of undenominational schools, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the difficulties that now arose would be removed under a system of popular control. With popular control there would be a check on anybody who wished to abuse his power of management—if he was only one on the board of management and the other managers were not his creatures. The local authority was expressly refused control over all questions relating to religious instruction, and by that refusal they were perpetuating the sources of religious controversy. The Government said they had carefully considered the grievance of single school areas, but were not able to find any remedy. What a confession of despair! Never had confession of despair been so clear before. Here was an admitted grievance which affected no other country in the same way, and the Government said, "We should like to remedy it but do not see our way."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that, although they had not remedied the grievance as they might wish to do, they had introduced into the Bill many mitigations.

MR. BRYCE said he could not remember anything being done, except in Clauses 8 and 9, and that, he thought, was rather an aggravation.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON cited the provision in regard to teachers.

MR. BRYCE said that remedy was partial, and did not remove the grievance of the Nonconformist parent. He would remind the Government of the famous phrase that unsettled questions had no pity for the repose of nations. This question, never completely settled, had at any rate sunk into a kind of tranquillity, but now the Government had made it infinitely more acute. They were sending this Bill out as a messenger of strife and bitterness. He believed that the Bill would excite stronger feelings of antagonism——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is not in order on every Amendment to make a general attack on the Bill.

MR. BRYCE said he would not pursue the subject. In the interests of the Church of England itself, as well as of education, they were bound to protest against the violation of principle involved in this Clause, and to record their opinion that only by accepting popular control would a solution of these difficulties be found.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said on this, the only occasion on which he had addressed the House this session, he would like to ask the Government if they could not find some means of mitigating this grievance, the existence of which they admitted. He joined issue with the Secretary to the Board of Education when he said that this was the only way in which the denominational character of the school could be secured. He believed it would have been well if the Government had, in the interest of education, and in order to make denominational teaching acceptable to the people, determined to widen the character of the school, and give the majority of the managing body to the public. The reason why the majority of the foundation representatives on the board of managers was so strongly insisted upon by the Government was evidently because the representatives of the public in their opinion could not be trusted. There could not be any other reason. His experience of local authorities had been quite the contrary Local authorities would do nothing unfair in regard to religious bodies. Who were they whom the Government would not trust? They were the people of England and Wales. But those same people elected Members of Parliament, and thus indirectly the Prime Minister, who appointed the bishops of that very Church this restriction was designed to protect. And yet those same people were not to be trusted with the appointment of the teachers of their own children paid for entirely by public money. Let them carry out the principle of trusting the people.

It being half-past seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [this day] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'four,' and insert the word 'two' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Compton Rickett.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'four' stand part of the Bill."

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR, continuing his speech, said he believed the substitution of four elected managers for two would make the measure more workable. It was not right to suggest that hon. Members were not honest in their desire to amend the Bill. They fully recognised the difficulties of the Government, but still they were anxious, as the Bill was to pass, to get one which would last a considerable time and commend itself to the people of the country. They believed that if the Bill gave what its authors professed that it gave—full control over the secular education of the elementary schools—it would be, if not what Nonconformists would desire, at all events generally acceptable to them. But it seemed impossible to have full control by a popularly elected authority when one of the most important functions of school management, *i.e.*, the appointment of teachers, was left in the hands of a body which was not popularly elected. What would be thought if he went to a shipbuilding yard or a large manufactory and said to the owner: "You shall have full control of the works, but I intend to engage all the men, with the exception, perhaps, of a few apprentices." Yet that was practically the position here! They were honest when they said they did not oppose the National Church as such. The persons elected, if the Amendment were carried, would not necessarily be Nonconformists, but if they were Nonconformists he did not believe they would be hostile to the Church, and they would properly carry out the provisions of the trust deeds. Whether Nonconformists or not, they would be honest Englishmen. It was a mistake to put the Church in this attitude of mistrust and hostility to the rest of the community. There was less of mutual hatred and suspicion than people sometimes thought. He was one of those Nonconformists who hoped that some day we should have national religious reunion, and that the Church of England might form a nucleus for that purpose. But this Clause did not show a comprehensive national spirit. It was lowering the National Church to the level of a sect. He believed that churchwardens were now elected by the parishioners generally, without regard to the religious faith of the electors. Did Nonconformists however, interfere in these matters, except in a few cases where there had been perhaps some objectionable practices carried on against which even Church people protested? The Bill was not in accord with the spirit of a National Church. He was a Nonconformist, but he had no hostility to the Church of England. He recognised it as the National Church, and was willing to give it all the respect it deserved. He was glad to recognise among a considerable number of hon. Members opposite the spirit of compromise and for that reason he followed the example of the Prime Minister the previous day and did not vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Greenwich. He wished it were possible, even at that last moment, to get rid of the spirit of hostility. Many of their grievances could be got rid of by giving popular control, as asked by the Amendment, and in the interests of the real unification of education, of real co-ordination, and of social and religious peace, he asked the Government whether, if they could not agree to this Amendment, they could not do something to recognise the principle of popular control in our educational system.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he did not think that the Secretary to the Education Department could have followed very closely the speech of the hon. Member for Scarborough, whose main argument was that where public money was concerned there should be a considerable proportion of publicly appointed persons to spend it. The hon. Gentleman in his reply lost sight of that argument altogether. He was, of course, in an unfortunate position, for he was the Parliamentary representative of a privileged class who had the power of voting not only in the Division in which they happened to reside but also of voting for a Member for the University. Brought up amid such surroundings, the hon. Gentleman had naturally lost sight of the principle of public control by popularly-elected persons. The mind of the Secretary for the Education Department was wholly bent on a sectarian monopoly in the management of public institutions. These schools were essentially public institutions, maintained out of public funds, and the hon. Gentleman could not get his mind from the narrow groove in which, unfortunately, he had been trained, into the broader position, that we ought to have public men to control public money. So alarmed was the hon. Gentleman for Church interests that he would trust nobody with a voice or veto in regard to religious education unless he was assured, and doubly assured, that they were quite safe. If the Church displayed less suspicion of public control it would occupy a much stronger position than it now did. Personally, he was a pronounced Nonconformist, and one of the poorest Members, perhaps, of the House of Commons. Yet, in spite of his strong convictions, he was no enemy of the Church, and out of his modest means he had been glad to make contributions to Church purposes in the parish in which he lived. Of course the Government did not dare to accept the Amendment. Their hands were not free. They were under the control of two or three prelates who were their masters in the matter of this Bill. Nonconformists were not the enemies of the Church, and they were not anxious to rob, despoil, dishonour or ridicule it. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister by his action was depriving the Church of much moral support. The Amendment was a reasonable one, for there ought to be a majority of publicly-elected representatives to control the large expenditure of money involved in the administration of the Bill. Under the plan the Government proposed the four managers would be responsible to nobody, and yet they were to have control of the vast revenues to be obtained from public sources. Only the other day he heard a manager of a school state publicly that he would rather that the children in the schools grew up ignorant than that they should fail to thoroughly learn the Church Catechism. Of course, he did not mean to suggest that all managers were so bigoted and narrow-minded, and even many of them who were were far too clever to express such views openly, but the fact remained that great powers were being placed in the hands of such men. It was very unfortunate that the Secretary to the Board of Education had been brought up in a University atmosphere; he might otherwise have been broad-minded. He sincerely regretted that the hon. Gentleman had dealt with the Amendment in his remarkable speech in so narrow and evasive a spirit.

*MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen had complained that no new arguments had been addressed to the House in support of the position taken up by the Government. But he forgot apparently that this was a fundamental part of the solution of the education problem which the Government was offering, and probably he would be the first to complain if hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House were to consume the small space of time left for discussion in repeating former arguments. In his opinion the proportion of four managers to two was essential to the maintenance of the denominational system. Everybody knew that the real object of hon. Gentlemen opposite was to do away with the denominational system. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman showed very clearly that that was the ultimate object he had in view. He told the House that nothing would meet their sense of injustice but the provision everywhere of undenominational schools.

MR. BRYCE: I did not argue this Amendment on that ground.

MR. BOUSFIELD said he was only pointing out the view of the right hon. Gentleman, and he took it that it was the view of the majority of those who were supporting the Amendment. It would mean that in many areas the undenominational school would have to take the place of the denominational school. The right hon. Gentleman forgot that the system the Government was asked to modify, in the sense of giving more popular control, was first established in 1869, when it was decided to incorporate denominational schools in the education system of the country. The right hon. Gentleman should have made his protest at that time; it was too late to do it now. Where was the sense of injustice of which the right hon. Gentleman complained, when one-fourth of the cost of those schools was paid out of public funds; where was it when a half, and eventually three-fourths, came to be so paid? All they were now doing was to secure complete control over secular education, and to bring the schools up to the highest standard of efficiency by providing the remaining fraction of public money necessary to keep them going. And what was the country getting in return for that? In the first place, the local authority was to have absolute control over secular education, and on every board of voluntary school managers there were to be placed two popularly appointed members. Remember that, hitherto, while nearly the whole cost of keeping up the schools had been paid out of public funds, there had been no popular representation on the management. That was not a system initiated by the present Government, but one that was started in 1869. The third thing they secured was the school-houses rent free, but that was a very small thing in comparison with the control that was to be given. It was objected that that control was not full or efficient, and that the only way to make it efficient was to have two managers representing the foundation and four popularly elected. But in many districts there would be practically direct control. He would take his own parish of Hendon as an example. That was an urban district with a population of over 20,000. Under the Bill, instead of their present School Board, they would have the District Council as the education authority. Each of the schools, whether board or voluntary, would have its board of managers under the direct control of the Council, and that control would be precisely the same as regarded secular education, whether the school was a board, Roman Catholic, or Church school. In every case it would be a direct control, and the managers would be bound to carry out the wishes of the popularly elected authority. There was, of course, the question of teachers. He would not go back on that point. All he would say was that it was the only way in which these schools could be retained as denominational schools and as part of the system of public elementary education, and it was the price that had to be paid by the public for that retention. He agreed that in the case of counties the control was more remote, though the remoteness was a question, not of machinery, but of distance. Under the Amendment the control would pass into the hands of a small body of elected parishioners, instead of being vested in the County Council, and some of the worst evils of the present system would be perpetuated. In the best interests of education it was absolutely essential that the control by the County Council, the more enlightened body, should be an effective control, and the idea of parochial control was out of the question. As to the contention of the right hon. Gentleman that this provision would introduce strife, it was simply idle rhetoric. What difference would the Amendment make? Simply, that instead of there being two on the one side and four on the other, there would be four on the one side and two on the other. The four would have the upper hand. [Opposition cheers.] If the object of hon. Members who cheered was to do away with denominational schools, let them say so. The object of the four managers was to preserve the denominational system. If hon. Members said they did not want that, they would show their honesty of purpose, but they could not in the same breath say that they wished to retain the denominational schools as part of the educational system of the country, and also that they wanted four undenominationalists to have the upper hand in regard to the maintenance of denominational teaching. If there was to be strife—and unfortunately there would be strife as long as people persisted in considering that this or that dogma, or that opposition to this or that dogma, was of more importance than true religion—the best thing that could be done was to set the different interests down at the same table, as the Government proposed to do. He would guarantee that there would be far less strife in the future over the management of the schools than there had been in the past. The essential principle of representative government was that conflicting interests should be brought together to discuss the points in dispute between them. If denominational schools were to be maintained, as they must be, as part of our system of national education, the denominationalists must have the upper hand in matters of religion.

(9.37.) MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) understood that the object of the Amendment in reducing the four foundation managers to two, and possibly increasing the elected managers to four, or leaving them on an equality, was to convert the sectarian schools, not into secular schools, but into Christian schools. There was a great distinction between a strictly denominational school, in which dogmatic theology was taught, and a Christian school in which there was nothing savouring of sectarian or dogmatic teaching.

MR. TALBOT asked the hon. Member to define Christian teaching.

MR. PERKS said he was not prepared to give a definition, but he knew from practical experience that the greatest distinction existed between a sacerdotally governed sectarian school and a school in which plain common-sense Bible teaching was given by the teachers. On the introduction of this Bill the First Lord of the Treasury said that those whom he called militant Nonconformists were to derive various benefits from this Bill. They had discovered none of those benefits so far. The paltry concession as to pupil teachers was worthless, and there was nothing in the Bill to justify the right hon. Gentleman in holding out the expectation that the Bill would meet some of the admitted grievances of Nonconformists. The right hon. Gentleman was not the first Prime Minister who had fed Nonconformity upon illusions; they were accustomed to that, to some extent, even under the *régime* of a Liberal Prime Minister. The compact of 1870 was forced upon Nonconformists by an ominous coalition between the then Leader of the Liberal Party, and a large number of Gentlemen who at that time sat on the Opposition side of the House. The claim that there should be four members of this local governing body appointed by the foundation managers was a grave injustice to vast masses of the community, especially in the great central counties. It could not be denied that in many counties, such as one or two of the Ridings of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Suffolk and Cornwall, Nonconformity was in an enormous majority, and that there was hardly an elementary school in those counties in which the children of Nonconformists did not greatly outnumber those of Anglican parents. Yet it was said that this majority of four against two must be maintained in order to impress upon the children in those schools the tenets of the Anglican Church. That was a grave injustice.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that the Amendment would leave the necessity for teaching Anglican theology in these schools absolutely unaffected; it would not make the schools Nonconformist.

MR. PERKS quite admitted that the new construction placed upon the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire by the law officers of the Crown——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was taking the interpretation placed upon the Amendment by its mover, viz., that if the Amendment were passed the instruction in each school would be according to the trust deeds of the school, so that in denominational schools the teaching would be denominational.

MR. PERKS admitted that the new construction placed on the recent Amendment of the hon. Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That has nothing to do with it.

MR. PERKS did not agree that it had nothing to do with it. If it was said that it was totally unimportant whether the four or two managers were appointed by the local authority or the foundation managers, because the religion to be taught in the school had nothing whatever to do with the managers, that it was altogether outside their purview, and that they were to have the religious instruction forced upon them by the dictum of the local clergy, with an appeal to the bishop—if that was the view taken, it was totally at variance with the speech of the Prime Minister a few days previously. This majority was distinctly defended on the ground that it would maintain the sectarian control of the schools, and one of the reasons why he wanted this majority reduced from four to two, was that he desired that these schools should be conducted not as sectarian schools, but in a more Christian spirit and more in consonance with the views of the overwhelming majority of the parents of the children who attended them in some of the great counties of the country. He feared it was almost too late to hope that the Government would make this important concession. It was one of the fundamental points in the whole Bill. The tests of teachers was one, the appointment of teachers was a second, and this was a third, and on these fundamental questions Nonconformists had received no concessions whatever. There was a growing feeling of discontent on their part—a feeling that they had been unjustly treated and, he was sorry to say, misled to some extent by the too friendly or too optimistic views of the Prime Minister as to the concessions that would be made with a view to removing Nonconformist grievances. He hoped that even at this late hour something might be done to fulfil the pledges which the Prime Minister unquestionably made when he introduced the Bill in March last.

(9.50.) DR. MACNAMARA said that this was one of the few questions in a very complex Bill in regard to which the issue was absolutely clear and simple. The Government averred that they must preserve the denominational system, while the Opposition declared that for every penny of public money spent there must be public control. Those two views were not in themselves incompatible, but they were entirely incompatible under the scheme of the Bill. The scheme of the Government was to create in each case a body of managers which should do two things at one and the same time—preserve denominational instruction and secure public control. He believed that it was impossible to do these two things with one and the same body of managers, and that in endeavouring to do it the First Lord of the Treasury was setting himself an impossible task. He had himself several times suggested a scheme by which the schools would be placed under full public control, and, at the same time, denominational teaching preserved. That plan was to rent the denominational buildings—to buy them out if they were for sale, or to supplant them by others—and then, having the schools under public control, to give the fullest facilities outside the time-table of the school to the denominationalists to come in and give denominational teaching.

LORD HUGH CECIL asked what would be the system of religious teaching ordinarily.

DR. MACNAMARA said he would have all the children join in a simple family Bible observance and prayer.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Would the Cowper-Temple Clause be maintained?

AN HON. MEMBER: And what about Roman Catholics?

DR. MACNAMARA said he had always admitted that the Roman Catholics would require special treatment—a sort of special treatment which was compatible with the system of popular control in existence all over Scotland at the present time. As to the Cowper-Temple Clause, it would not be maintained in its entirety. The school would be opened with common family worship—the singing of a hymn and the recitation of a prayer—and that would be an end of it so far as the school was concerned. After school he would give the fullest facilities, free of any charge, to anybody to come in and give religious instruction according to the faith preferred by the parents of the children.

*MR. SPEAKER: These details as to the mode in which religious instruction should be carried on do not arise on this Amendment. To some extent they are involved in the question of whethe the foundation managers are to have a majority, and hon. Members may state their views as to what the result may be, but this detailed discussion is out of order.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he would at once bow to Mr. Speaker's ruling, and he would not pursue that point any further. Whatever might be the result of this Bill, the system arrived at in our Colonies, after a chastening which this country was likely to go through for the next ten years, would be the system they would arrive at. The Government said they would put denominational schools upon the rates. He was very glad they had done so, and he was extremely glad that that bold step had been taken. He was tired of the system which was maintained by voluntary subscriptions, for it was a dangerous anachronism. The Government intended to evade popular control, which was a consequence of rate aid. In that they were pursuing quite a futile course. The most remarkable thing in connection with the discussions on education during the last ten years was the extraordinary change of front on the part of the Church of England. He had made a close study of the attitude of the Church of England for the last ten years, and he was quite astonished at the change of front which had taken place, more particularly on this question of rate aid. In 1895 the position of the Church was not to touch the rates under any circumstances, because the feeling was that popular control must follow, and that that would be the undoing of the denominational system. In 1895 the Archbishops' Committee submitted some recommendations to Lord Salisbury as a basis on which the Government should legislate upon the education question, and they were then of the opinion that if the schools came upon the rates they would cease to be denominational. Therefore, they were afraid to come on the rates. Dr. Temple, at that time, was of the opinion that it would be best for the Church to consider whether it would not be better to surrender some of their schools to the School Board than put the Church schools on the slippery slope of the support of the rates. On the 9th of June, 1896, the Bishop of Gloucester said that in regard to accepting aid from the rates, the objection seemed to be insurmountable, for if they received money from the rates they could not remain free in the management of the schools. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India spoke at Stepney on November 3rd, 1896, and he asked, "Could the right to religious teaching be maintained if voluntary schools were put upon the rates?" The Government had tried to maintain that right. The noble Lord in that speech went on to say that he very much doubted this, because the moment a charge was put upon the rates those who paid the rates would try to get control over the expenditure of the money. Lord Cross's Commission of 1888 suggested a rate aid of 10s. per child for voluntary schools, and that was scouted by Churchmen. The then Bishop of London, at the Church Congress in the same year, said he was confident that any proposal to put the schools bodily on the rates, and so do away with the necessity of voluntary subscriptions, was tantamount to giving up the voluntary schools altogether. Therefore hon. Members opposite, who with their eyes open placed these schools upon the rates, must stand the consequences. Lord Selborne was a member of the Archbishops' Committee which sat in 1895, and he said that he looked with the greatest fear to their having to take any such course as that of claiming any share of the rates, for that would be handing the schools over body and soul to the enemy. He had no shadow of a doubt that the rate aid meant absolute public control in the long run, and they could not keep down the public representatives to the proportion of two out of six. Up to the last year or two all the leaders of the Church had been profoundly against rate aid, because it would mean the destruction of the voluntary system. Dr. Temple had said that to take a share of the rates would, to his mind, have a disastrous and lowering effect, and he did not see how the rates could possibly come to them without popular control accompanying it. He thought they were creating a Frankenstein which would destroy the system which, before the State had any concern in the matter, many Church-people made sacrifices to build up. They could not possibly avoid the inevitable consequence of rate aid, which was complete popular control.

He had found that in the immediate future the cost of maintenance of each child in denominational schools would be about 55s. per year from public funds. The denominationalists were to contribute roughly about 3s. per child for the use of the buildings, and the Church was to keep up the fabric, or, rather, that was intended during the early discussion of the Bill. One of the early Clauses provided that the managers should maintain the fabric out of funds provided by them, and that was called a fair bargain. Since then that bargain had been whittled down. The total cost of maintenance would come to about 60s. per child, and 55s. of this would come out of the public funds. In other words, eleven-twelfths of the money would be found by the public, and one-twelfth by the denomination. Under this Bill, in return for finding eleven-twelfths of the money, the public was to have two-sixths, or four-twelfths, of the management of the schools. The public ought to have at least eleven-twelfths of the management if they found eleven-twelfths of the money. Personally he viewed the future with the utmost equanimity. He very much objected to the Accommodation Clauses, which he thought were vicious to the last degree. He objected to the sweeping off from voluntary funds of the obligation to keep up the fabric. He felt sure that by this proposal the Government were endeavouring to do an impossible task. When they came down upon the ratepayers and presented a demand upon them for their schools, they would find that the ratepayers would want to have something to do with the management.

(10.15.) MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said that as a Churchman, and as one actuated with nothing but the best wishes towards the Church, he desired to say a few words about this Clause and about the Amendment which had been moved. As one who had listened a very great deal to the discussion and said very little, he was astonished to notice that there appeared to exist on the part of the clergy a rooted distrust of the people. He was sorry to say this, but he was afraid the evidences of it were too strong to be ignored. The Church claimed to have a distinct majority in the country. He thought that in some cases very exaggerated claims had been made. He heard of a clergyman the other day who stated that in his opinion the Nonconformists were in the habit of overrating their numbers and their strength, and he said that if they could be numbered accurately, they would be found to be in a considerable minority. This clergyman said he was the chaplain of a prison where there were 103 prisoners in the gaol, and of that number no less than ninety-eight were members of the Church of England. The explanation of that was that in a country with an Established Church, every prisoner whose religion was unknown was put down as belonging to the Established Church. The claim made by the Church was the inalienable right of the parents to have their children brought up in the faith of their fathers and their forefathers. Surely that also applied to the children of Nonconformists. Why could not the clergy trust the people? If they would only do so it would strengthen their position enormously, and by refusing to do this they were striking a blow at their Church. They had heard repeatedly of the almost insane dislike on the part of the Church to publicly elected bodies and to School Boards. They had heard over and over again charges of irreligious tendencies brought against board schools, which had often been refuted. The Leader of the Opposition the other day gave a number of statistics in regard to the composition of five of our largest School Boards, and it was found that over 60 per cent. of them were Churchmen, and about 30 per cent. Nonconformists. They had had the testimony of the Archbishop of Canterbury in regard to the efficiency of the education given in board schools. The County Council of the county which he represented had had a special meeting to consider this Bill. On that Council there was a considerable majority of Conservatives, but after discussing this Clause they passed a resolution by an overwhelming majority of quite two to one that inasmuch as the public were going to find most of the money the public ought to have a majority upon the board of managers of voluntary schools. In order to prevent an agitation in the shape of resistance to the rates, he urged upon the Government the necessity of adopting some suggestion which would remove the grievance complained of.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) regretted that the Government had not seen their way clear to accept the recommendation made, he thought from both sides of the House, to give the public an equal representation with those representing the trust. He ventured to think that if that policy had been pursued, and the denominational character of the schools maintained, it would have done away with a good deal of the suspicion and friction that had since arisen. He was fully aware that it would have been necessary to modify Clause 73 of the 1870 Act, otherwise the denominational character would not be preserved. He was not partial to the preservation of the denominational character in our schools. He would very much prefer a national system of education with the simple reading of the Bible, and a simple exposition, but he was convinced that that was impossible of attainment at the present moment. Notwithstanding his disappointment that the Government had not been able to give a larger public control on these committees, he was still hopeful that, with the control of the County Council and the Borough Council, and with the two representatives of the public on the committees, a more liberal method of carrying on these schools would obtain in the future than had been the case in the past. If he had to make his choice, he had no hesitation in saying, as a sincere Nonconformist, that he would much prefer this Bill, with all its defects, to the suggested policy of preferential treatment for Roman Catholics.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) hoped that this dreadful Amendment would be withdrawn. If it was not withdrawn, let the House understand the position so far as Catholics were concerned. The mover of the Amendment proposed that in regard to every Catholic school a majority of Protestants should control the teaching of Catholic dogma. [Cries of "No."] They would have full power to send four Protestants to control Catholic education if the Amendment were carried. He did not look upon the hon. Member for North Camberwell as a bigoted secularist, but he would like to know what his general Christian teaching was. Did he now really want a majority of Protestant managers to control Catholic schools? Did he want to send to a Catholic school a Protestant teacher? They had been told that Catholics should get separate preferential treatment, and that had been advocated on the Liberal side of the House. There were over 500 Amendments to the Bill put on the Paper, but did a single Liberal Member put down an Amendment in favour of preferential Catholic treatment? He was not aware of one, but if any hon. Member did, he apologised to him. The fact was, the Roman Catholics had been used by the Nonconformists as a sort of red herring drawn across the trail. Catholics were quite aware of that. He believed that the Liberal Members were really, in their hearts, fairly disposed to Catholics, but they did not dare propose preferential treatment and face their constituencies. Catholics were now offered a good Bill. Mr. Davitt stated recently in the United States that they would now get 15s. per child more. Mr. Davitt was not a friend, but an opponent, of the Bill, and yet that was his opinion. That was a very large sum of money to the Catholics. If the Leader of the Opposition would get up and say that he would bring in a Bill proposing preferential treatment for Catholics, he would be ready to say, "Let the Church of England and the Nonconformists fight their own battle." But as there was no prospect of that, he thought Catholics were right to accept what they could get now under this Bill. The hon. Member for North Camberwell said that as the taxpayers found the money they ought to have the control of the schools. But surely the hon. Member was aware that Roman Catholics also paid taxes. It had been stated that an agitation was springing up againstth e Bill; but if the Roman

Catholics were true to themselves in Ireland and in England it would be of little avail.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said it appeared to him that the question now before the House was one of great gravity from the broad point of view. Those who sent him to Parliament had been giving consideration to this Bill. While he accorded a general support to the Government, he believed that he had a clear mandate from his constituents on this subject. He did not think the Government were entirely aware of the popular sentiment in Scotland. His fellow-countrymen in Scotland were unable to understand this principle of four and two managers as arranged by the Bill. The Government could not dissociate the principle of public control from the granting of public money from the rates. He believed that a blunder had been committed by the Government in this matter, and he urged them to concede equality of representation as a wise and prudent policy in the interest of those whom they were desirous to serve.

(10.38.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 585.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Amendments made—

"In Clause 7, page 3, line 34, leave out 'so long as,' and insert 'but.' In Clause 7, page 3, line 35, after 'them,' insert 'only so long as.' In Clause 7, page 3, line 41, and page 4, line 1, leave out 'with respect to,' and insert 'for.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said he wished to move the omission of sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 7, in order to ascertain the views of the Government in regard to inspection. This was the only place in which inspection was mentioned in the Bill. He thought it was understood by the Government and the House that His Majesty's Inspectors should still continue to inspect all the schools; but the local education authorities would also appoint their own inspectors, and he hoped something would be put into the Bill in regard to the duplication of inspection of the schools all over the country. Duplication of inspection would not be good for the schools, for the local education authority, or for the ratepayers, and he was anxious that this should be avoided.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 6, to leave out sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that he was fully alive to the risk and the evil of duplication of inspection, and it should, so far as it lay in his power, be avoided. His right hon. friend would not expect him to say what line the Board of

Education would take up in every case, because much would depend on the local authority and on local circumstances; but he might safely say that it would be the desire of the Board of Education to act with the local authorities, and to enter into some arrangement by which the results of their inspection could be utilised for the benefit of the local authorities.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said that after that explanation by the Secretary to the Board of Education he would withdraw his Amendment.

MR HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said he was glad that the answer of his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education foreshadowed some amount of Departmental action in regard to inspection. If that could be done without endangering the efficiency of the schools, it would prove of great advantage

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LAMBERT, in moving that the words "the consent of" should be omitted from the beginning of sub-Section (*c*), said that his intention was subsequently to move the insertion of other words, the effect of which would be that the local authority should appoint and dismiss teachers. That was, indeed, the clear issue which he proposed to submit to the House. It was said that the local authority would have the control of all secular education; but it was impossible that they should have such control unless they had the absolute right to the appointment and dismissal of teachers. Ninety-five per cent. of the instruction in the schools was secular, and it was absolutely impossible for the local authority to have control over it unless they had the power to appoint and dismiss the teachers. The local authority ought to be trusted and given as much power as possible. At present there was a form of dual control in regard to the appointment of teachers, but there was, unfortunately, no provision for the dual payment of the teachers. Not a single penny of the teachers' salaries would be paid by the managers; and he insisted that the principle should be observed that those who paid the teachers should control their appointment and their dismissal. They knew very well that the success of a school largely depended upon the masters, and if the control of the local authority was to be real it was absolutely necessary that his Amendment should be carried. Under the Bill the Board of Education was to be called in, in the event of any dispute arising between the local authority and the managers. He had not a profound confidence in the Board of Education. The hon. Gentleman the present Secretary to the Board of Education would not always be in power. A change was possible, and another gentleman might be appointed head of the Department who had different views from those held by the hon. Baronet. But if the local authority were made responsible for the appointment and dismissal of the teachers, they would maintain the even tenor of their way, and their policy would be far more stable than under the control of the Board of Education. They had been told that to give the power of appointing the teachers to the local authority would be to destroy the denominational character of the schools. He could not see that. There was, he contended, a great deal of truth in a statement of an hon. Member that in this matter the Church would be far better off if they trusted the local authorities. These would not be revolutionary bodies. Most of the County Councils had a large majority of Conservative members, and they would not be likely to do anything which would inflict any grievance on the denominational schools which they had under their control. The defects in the Bill were bound to be cured in the long run, because the country would assert itself. They had had a division the previous day on a most extreme clerical Clause, and although the Prime Minister gave the House no lead in the matter, that extreme clerical Clause was rejected by an enormous majority. They had seen over and over again that the right hon. Gentleman would not give any real power to the local education authorities. This could not be a lasting settlement unless his Amendment were carried. There would be no security for the teachers, who would be under the harrow of the managers, whereas, if his Amendment were carried, the teachers would be under the control of the local education authority, which was a body more likely to give them fair play than the managers. It seemed to him that they had no right to ask that something like 11,000 head teachers in the country should be submitted to a denominational test. Such a thing was unknown in National Government. He did not suppose that the Prime Minister asked the members of His Government what their religious convictions were; and why should they ask the teachers? The Bill put the clock backwards, and apparently religious tests were to be revived. It was an insult to the Nonconformists of the country to say that they were not to have a share in the teaching of any of these 11,000 schools. It had been said that concessions had been made to the Nonconformists; but he would like the head of the Education Department to tell the Nonconformists how they were to benefit under this Bill. He was afraid that the hon. Baronet would have the greatest difficulty in doing so. If the power were given to the local authorities to appoint and dismiss the teachers, that would, he was convinced, reduce a large amount of objection to the Bill. The concession which had been given in regard to assistant and pupil teachers was no concession, when the appointment of the head teachers was left in the hands of the managers, who were to have regard to the religious convictions of the head teachers. It was stated by the Prime Minister that the Roman Catholics formed an effective bar to giving the local education authority the right to appoint teachers, but for his part he did not see that the Roman Catholics presented any obstacle in the way. He said most distinctly that time was on their side in this matter, and that the system organised by the Bill would not go on. From a political point of view he believed that nothing would be better for his party than that the Government should reject his Amendment, because if they accepted it a great part of the opposition to the Bill would, as he had said, fall to the ground. Directly the ratepayers realised that they were to be saddled with all the expense of maintaining these schools, and at the same time were to be deprived of the power of appointing and dismissing teachers, they would rebel and there would be a change probably much more drastic than he suggested by his Amendment. The Clause was contrary to fair play. It was against fair play that one half of the community should be banned from putting teachers into these schools. He insisted that the Bill would not be workable, and that it would not effect that educational reform which they had all hoped to see.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out the words 'the consent of.'"—(*Mr. Lambert.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that hitherto they had been reviving, with zest and at some length, the discussions of last summer, but now they were asked to reconsider a matter which was discussed with great animation and also at considerable length a month ago. He hoped it would not be considered disrespectful if he did not answer the hon. gentleman in great detail. The managing body constituted by Clause 6 was constituted with the definite object of preserving the denominational character of the schools. They ought to have something to manage, and the principal business of their management was surely the appointment of the teachers. He did not think that the House would go back on what it had already done in regard to school management.

*Mr. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said he moved a similar Amendment a month ago, but the arguments then advanced had not been answered; neither had the arguments which his hon. friend had brought forward to-night been answered. There was a grievance, which was not inconsiderable, felt by Nonconformists in the matter. There were about 11,000 voluntary schools out of the 20,000 public elementary schools in the country; and, mainly speaking, in those 11,000 schools the teachers were members of one denomination, while in the remaining 9,000 schools half the teachers at least were members of the Church of England, because the training colleges, which were supported by public funds to which Nonconformists contributed, were absolutely closed to members of the Nonconformist bodies, and, therefore, Nonconformists were unable to receive a proper training as teachers.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said they would have a proper training under the Bill.

*MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said a large number of Nonconformists would still be in a very inferior position as he understood the Bill. The training colleges of the country had as boarders only those who belonged to one denomination, and the result was that members of that denomination were placed in a privileged position.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that under the Bill all that would be changed, as there was unlimited power to train teachers in rate-aided institutions.

*MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said he was quite prepared to admit that certain powers were conferred on the County Councils.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR : Full powers.

*MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE said that the Prime Minister must be aware that there was no prospect of such institutions being provided in any event for some years to come, and the prospect of an immediate increase of rates of 6d. to 1s. in the £ above those at present enforced in connection with elementary education, made it most unlikely that County Councils would further add to the rates and provide new training colleges. It was, therefore, most important, if only to secure efficiency, that all State-aided denominational colleges should be thrown open to Nonconformists. Out of the 20,000 head-masters in the country he believed that some 16,000 or 17,000 would be selected from one denomination alone, and as long as that grievance existed they were justified in protesting against this Bill and supporting this Amendment.

(11.18.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes 82. (Division List No. 586.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somers't,E.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell,W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Milner,Rt.Hn. SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

*(11.30.) MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the object of the Amendment which he desired to move was to provide that the appointment of teachers of all grades in non-provided as well as in provided schools, should be made without reference to religious creed or denomination. The words in the Bill referred only to the appointment of assistant teachers and pupil teachers, and that was qualified by the mysterious words "if it is thought fit." It was not clear by whom it was to be thought fit; but presumably it would be by the managers, and they would be unlikely to appoint teachers without reference to creed or denomination. He desired to omit the words "if it is thought fit," and also the limitation of the Clause to assistant teachers and pupil teachers. It was held that in a denominational school an assistant teacher or a pupil teacher of another denomination might be appointed; but that the head teacher should be of the denomination to which the school belonged. He admitted that the option to appoint pupil teachers and assistant teachers of another denomination was a slight advance on the present system; but he based his Amendment on the change which was to be made with regard to the maintenance of the schools. Hitherto, a denominational school had been a *quasi*-private institution. It had relations to the State which were very loose and indirect, and the contract between the teacher and the managers was one in which the Board of Education took no part. That was all to be changed. The denominational schools, so far as secular education was

concerned, would be under the local authority, and were to be wholly maintained from public sources; and, therefore, he claimed that the provision with reference to the appointment of teachers in those schools should be similar to that in provided schools. What was the case at present with regard to the board schools? A School Board laid down the syllabus of religious instruction. It was known to the applicants for positions as teachers under the Board, and it was understood that every person applying was willing and prepared to give that instruction. He submitted that that should be the case also with regard to the denominational schools. He was not prepared to say that it was the proper thing for a man who did not accept the creed of a certain denomination to accept employment as a teacher in a school belonging to that denomination; but he was prepared to say that the question of his sincerity was not a question into which other people should go. If the test proposed to be applied to teachers in denominational schools were to be applied to incumbents in denominational benefices, he thought strange results would emerge; and he claimed that freedom to undertake the duty of giving religious instruction should be granted to teachers, as well as to persons who were engaged in giving religious instruction in a higher sphere. They had done away with religious tests at the universities, and the tendency of the time and of public feeling was against their perpetuation, especially in institutions maintained by public funds. The denominational school of the future would not be a *quasi*-private institution, but would be a wholly public institution; and, to all intents and purposes, so far as its funds were concerned, it would be under the general control of the local authority, and would be on the same footing as a board school. They had not laid down in the case of board schools, that no one should teach whose religious creed or private views went beyond the Cowper-Temple Clause; and he submitted that they had no right in a new kind of board school to lay down the principle that a teacher should be tested to see if his religious views were such as the school required. That was a matter between the teacher himself and his conscience, but if he was found not to discharge his duty properly, or not to give the religious instruction which was required, he could, under the Bill, be dismissed. If the teacher did his work satisfactorily, that would be sufficient. If he did not, then he could be dismissed; but let them not lay down a theological test of an invidious character which was entirely opposed to the spirit of the time and the feeling of the nation, and which was the sole survivor of many tests which had existed in the past. That would be wrong in theory, fallacious in practice, and repugnant to the free institutions of the country, and ought to be removed from the Bill. No practical difficulty would arise if the test were removed, as the main stream of teachers who would apply for employment in non-provided schools would belong to the Church of England; but if the test were removed, a measure of religious liberty would be given to a class who, after the passing of the Bill, would be in all respects public servants, without in the least interfering with the efficient teaching of the articles and creed of the Church of England in non-provided schools. It was not as if the immediate result of his Amendment would be that teachers would be appointed to Church of England schools who were Agnostics, or Baptists, or Methodists. The bulk of the teachers would be, for many years to come, qualified to give religious instruction in Church of England schools. What he claimed was that the fact that a candidate presented himself for employment in a non-provided school, whether it was Church of England, Wesleyan or Roman Catholic, ought to be taken as evidence that he was willing to give instruction in that school, and if his educational credentials were satisfactory, he ought to be allowed to enter that school without being asked whether he was a communicant of the Church of England, or a believer in the Athanasian Creed. After the passing of the Bill, a teacher in a non-provided school would be, to all intents and purposes, a public servant. At present he was not a public servant, and was engaged on a contract between himself and private persons who, by an anachronism, had the management of a school eleven-twelfths of the income of which was provided out of public sources. By a legal fiction, a denominational school was at present a private institution, and the teacher was a private person, and it might be said that the House had no right to interfere with any test which the managers of a denominational school might set up. But all that was to be changed. Although the appointment of teachers in the future would rest with the managers, the teachers would be public servants; and was it to be contended that any Government would think of setting up a system of theological tests, direct or indirect, for the public servants of the country? It was not done in the case of the Welsh Intermediate Act, or in the case of the Technical Education Acts. The stream of tendency for the last twenty or thirty years had been in the direction of removing theological tests, and he asked the House to follow that stream, and not to attempt to obstruct or dam it. If they did, they would do violence to the feeling of the country and to the consciences of many thousands of future public servants. It might be said that the teachers would not suffer in the future any greater hardship than they had suffered in the past, but the position was changed, and the teachers, as citizens and Englishmen, had a right to claim that this matter should be put on a proper footing. The teachers were not willing to submit to those tests. They had perhaps to submit to them in the past as a condition of their employment, but not willingly, and he ventured to express the warning that such a condition in the Bill would set up another subject of irritation in every locality, and would be another reason why the Bill would not be regarded as a settlement of the question. In the name of the teachers, he protested against such a test being applied to them. It could be removed without any practical difficulty, and he claimed that the sole judge in the matter should be the teacher as between himself and his conscience. If he failed to give the teaching required he could be dismissed. For all these reasons he claimed that justice should be done to the teachers, and it was for that reason that he moved his Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out the words 'Provided that assistant teachers and pupil teachers may be appointed if it is thought fit,' and insert the words 'the appointment of teachers shall be made from among persons willing to teach in the school.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he was not sure how far the words proposed by the hon. Member would carry out his object. As the Bill originally stood the managers had discretion in the choice of teachers, except in cases where it was limited by the trust deed to persons of a particular denomination. The Government had introduced an Amendment extending the discretion of the managers where the trust deed imposed a limitation, except as regarded the head teacher, and by that the Government were prepared to stand. As he understood the hon. Member, he not only wished the managers to have the widest possible discretion whatever the trust deed might say, but that the managers should be forbidden to ask a teacher whether he was or was not prepared conscientiously to give denominational teaching, on which the very existence of the school as a non-provided school depended. That would impose on the managers a disability so gross as to be almost ludicrous. It was a disability which would not be imposed on any other employer, and he really hoped the House would not consider long before rejecting the proposal of the hon. Member.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he wished to submit that if the words were inserted they would inflict a blow on Nonconformists rather than confer a benefit on them. Was it likely that anyone would be unwilling to accept the appointment of teacher? The words were perfectly futile, and if they were accepted they would be substituted for words which, although they might not go as far as hon. Members opposite desired, would certainly have the effect of throwing open thousands of places in the schools to Nonconformist teachers.

MR. BRYCE said that the answer given by the Secretary to the Board of Education entirely passed by the salient feature of the position, which was that the schools would change their character, and that the teachers would become practically the public servants of the State. The imposition of a test on civil servants had no parallel in any part of the administration of the country. In some respects the position would be worse than it was at present. Many trust deeds did not restrict the appointment of a teacher from a particular denomination, but the proviso which the Government intended to insert in the Bill referred only to assistant teachers and pupil teachers, and, therefore, implied that the head teacher should be appointed from the denomination.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the object of the Clause which would be inserted at a later stage was to give the managers a wider discretion where the trust deed limited that discretion.

MR. BRYCE said he thought that this might very well be construed by the managers as a direction to them to appoint teachers from the denomination. That would be the interpretation which the managers would be likely to put upon the Clause. The whole case had been very fully and clearly argued by his hon. friend, and he would only add that, to his mind, there was not in the whole Bill a provision more retrograde or unfortunate, or more calculated to prejudice the teaching profession, and that interest which the public had in securing the widest choice of competent men to enter the teaching profession. That was the broadest interest the public had, and it would be narrowed by the proposed provision.

*MR. BULL (Hammersmith) said he should like to ask the hon. Member who moved the Amendment whether it was not a fact that the London School Board, on more than one occasion, refused to appoint teachers who professed Free Thought. Without entering into the merits of the matter, was not this a religious test? If it was not, what was it?

*MR. YOXALL said he was not aware of the case to which the hon. Member referred, but the inference he drew was not correct. He had already stated his own view ——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has already spoken on the Question before the House.

(11.53.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 69; Noes, 168. (Division List, No. 587.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellis, John Edward
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Methyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norman, Henry
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York (W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Crptain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Cann, James
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrison, James Archibald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphrey Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after midnight, further consideration, as amended, stood adjourned till Tomorrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 2:—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 27th November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SOUTH AFRICA, 1902.

Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into sentences passed under Martial Law [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (OPIUM).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 20th November; *Mr. Henry J. Wilson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 383.]

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of forty minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning Forms of Instruction for certain County Boroughs, Counties and Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2918 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ALTERATIONS IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Address for "Return showing (1) the names of those present at the Conference on the 28th day of February, 1894, of Representatives of the King's Printers and the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge to consider proposed Alterations in the Printing of the Prayer Book; (2) a list of all the alterations in the Printing of the Prayer Book then arranged; and (3) the authority under which the three Presses took action."—(*Mr. Charles M'Arthur.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Hackney Downs Railway Accident—Intercommunication Apparatus.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the statement contained in the last paragraph of the Report of Lieutenant Colonel Von Donop, R.E., concerning the accident which occurred on the Great Eastern Railway near Hackney Downs Station on the 25th April last, will he state whether the Railway Company have yet provided all carriages on their passenger trains with the apparatus for intercommunication which has been approved by the combined Railway Companies; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Railway Company concerned have informed the Board of Trade that, under instructions given by the directors in March last, all their existing passenger carriages are being fitted with the apparatus when they come into the workshop for repairs; it had previously been determined by the company that all new carriages should be so fitted. The hon. Member is no doubt aware that Railway Companies are under no statutory obligation to fit with communication apparatus trains that do not run twenty miles without stopping.

Coastguards, Ilfracombe Division—Alleged Neglectful Look-out.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on Thursday night, the 13th instant, two vessels, *i.e.*, the "Bessie Clark," of Braunton, North Devon, and the "Ouse," of Appledore, were in a serious danger of being wrecked after crossing the bar at the mouth of the estuary of the Taw and Torridge; whether he is aware that flareups were burnt as danger signals by the crew of the "Ouse," and by the crew of the "James," of Appledore; whether he is aware that no notice was taken, and no assistance rendered by any one; and will he cause inquiry to be made into the failure of the coastguard to keep a look-out in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have obtained a Report on the case to which the hon. Member refers from the Inspecting Commander of Ilfracombe Division of Coastguard. It appears that the flares were seen by the coastguard both at Downend Point and Westward Ho, but as the weather was fine at the time and the wind moderate it was supposed that they were intended as a signal for a pilot. The coxswain of the Appledore lifeboat is stated to have understood the signals in the same way. I will make further inquiry as to the confusion of signals that appears to have arisen.

Coal Duty—Decreased Import of British Coal into Russia.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a recent consular report from Pernau stating that the quantity of coal imported into that port during the year 1901 amounted to 37,220 tons, of which 20,695 were British and 16,525 Westphalian, while in 1900, the year before the imposition of the coal duty, 40,375 tons, all British, were imported; and will he say when the report will be presented to Parliament; and, seeing that the general decline in trade activity has been this year accompanied by an increased total exportation of British coal when bunker coal is added, will he say whether he has official information assigning any reason for the particular result the general decline has had at Pernau.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The consular report referred to has already been presented to Parliament (No. 2911, Annual Series), and if the hon. Member will consult it, he will see that the experience of the buyers of Westphalian coals at Pernau was such that the British Vice-Consul does not think those coals are likely to be imported there again. As regards the cause of the decline, the general remarks that I made on the subject in the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on Monday last † apply to the case of Pernau.

Vaccination—Fees for Exemption Certificates.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a recent decision of the magistrate at the Marylebone Police Court, in which a medical man, who claimed a certificate of exemption under the Vaccination Act in respect of a child born in August last was required to pay a fee of 1s. for the exemption certificate; and, seeing that this fee has to be paid by persons of the poorer classes who have conscientious objections to vaccination, will he state upon what ground a magistrate has power to make this charge for an exemption certificate.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) A fee such as that mentioned is charged for a certificate of exemption from vaccination in accordance with the ordinary law governing the charges made in connection with proceedings before magistrates. The charge is not confined to this class of certificate. The magistrate has power in a proper case, on application, to remit fees.

Cruelty to Children—Penruddocke Case—Alteration of Law—Removal of Mr. Penruddocke's Name from Roll of Magistrates.

CAPTAIN GREVILLE (Bradford, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the sentence imposed upon Mrs. Penruddocke, convicted of cruelty to one of her children at the recent sessions at the Central Criminal Court, by which a fine was inflicted for aggravated cruelty; and whether, in view of the fact that sentences of imprisonment are sometimes awarded in cases of cruelty to children, he proposes to introduce legislation which would secure uniformity of punishment in such cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) Detailed answers were given to somewhat similar Questions yesterday. I would only add that legislation to secure uniformity of punishment in all cases is as impossible as it would be undesirable. The punishment must obviously vary according to the circumstance of each case as they present themselves to the Court. Statutes can only define the limits within which the variation may take place.

MR. HOGG (Sussex, Eastbourne): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the verdict of the jury in the Penruddocke case and the censure passed on Mr. Penruddocke, his name will be allowed to remain on the rota of justices of the peace; and whether he will consider the advisability of proposing a change in the law to prevent the possibility of cruelty being inflicted on young children without imprisonment.

---

† See page 235.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) In answer to the first paragraph I must repeat my answer of yesterday to the effect that it is not proposed to remove the name of the gentleman in question from the Commission of the Peace. As regards the second paragraph, I think it must be obvious that no such hard and fast rule for assigning the punishment without regard to the circumstances of the case would be admissible.

Cost of Training Seamen.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the cost per head for trained seamen from the time they joined till they have passed through the gunnery and torpedo schools and are regarded as efficient.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The average cost per head from time of joining to date of becoming either a seaman gunner in a gunnery school, or seaman torpedo man in a torpedo school, is as follows:—

	If trained as a boy in stationary training ship.	If trained as a boy in sea-going training ship.
	£	£
Seaman gunner -	291	261
Seaman torpedo man	314	284

Alleged Dishonesty of a Glasgow Lawyer.

MR. BAIRD (Glasgow, Central): To ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been drawn to an interlocutor issued by Sheriff Boyd, Glasgow, on the 19th November, in which he describes as dishonest the conduct of a certain lawyer in withholding, by means of false representations, damages which had been awarded to his client for injuries received in the course of his employment; and will he state whether he proposes to take any further steps in the case.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The facts stated by my hon. friend are substantially correct. I am informed, however, that the case is under appeal, and I must await the result of that appeal before considering whether there is any action that ought to be taken.

Promotion in the Central Telegraph Office.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the statements of the late Controller of the Central Telegraph Office that the only qualifications for entry into the senior class of telegraphists were good conduct, seniority, and manipulative ability, he will explain why a telegraphist has been promoted over the heads of thirty of his fellows; and whether, in view of the repeated assurances that the conditions of entry into the senior class have remained unaltered since 1881, he will state if the men passed over are of good conduct and possess manipulative ability.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I must ask the hon. Member to refer to the answer given by me to the Question of the hon. Member for Hoxton on 13th of this month,† to which I have nothing to add.

Central Telegraph Office—Appointment of Supervisors.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that officials attached to the personal staff of the Controller Central Telegraph Office have been given important positions on the superintending staff of the commercial section; will he say whether these officers have previously performed the work of supervision among telegraph operators and are acquainted with the technical and practical part of their duties; and whether he will explain why men who have performed the work of supervision in the instrument gallery for a number of years have not been selected for these positions.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The two officers who were recently promoted from the Controller's Office to be superintendents in the Central Telegraph Office had been assistant superintendent and assistant superintendent 2nd Class, respectively, in the general body before entering the Controller's Office, and were well acquainted with the duties of supervision. These officers were chosen because, in my opinion, they were the best fitted for the duties of their new posts.

---

† See preceding volume, page 859.

Bilbao Harbour Lights.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the losses sustained by the mercantile marine through the present system of lighting of the entrance to Bilbao Harbour, will he state whether the Spanish authorities have yet been induced to render the lighting more effective.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) Since my answer to the hon. Member's Question on this subject of the 7th of May last† His Majesty's Consul at Bilbao has reported that the apparatus for the lighthouse now in course of construction has been ordered.

Volunteer Long Service Medal—Suggested Alterations.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the increased stringency of the requirements for Volunteer efficiency, he will consider the advisability of granting the Volunteer long service medal for ten years service, instead of twenty as now, and granting a bar or clasp for every further period of five years service; and whether he would be willing to change the colour of the present ribbon attached to this medal from its present shade of dark green, either by the insertion of a white stripe in the present ribbon, or by replacing it altogether by one of a brighter and more attractive hue.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I do not think the multiplication of medals proposed in the Question would tend to raise their value in the eyes of the Volunteer Force, and no proposal has been made to the War Office to alter the colour of the present ribbon. I therefore think it would be inexpedient to adopt the suggestions put forward in the Question.e

Reserve of Officers—Gratuities.

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the case that captains and majors of the reserve of officers, retiring on pensions of £200 a year, after twenty or more years service, are eligible for any benefits under Paragraph 601A of the Royal Warrant; whether officers having less than twenty years service, who have retired with gratuities, can under Paragraph 601A obtain additional gratuities of £400, being the difference between gratuities already received and the larger amount payable in respect of longer periods of service completed during mobilisation; whether, while the pensions of mobilised reserve officers have been suspended during their employment on full pay, they receiving only the difference between pension and pay for the further services they have rendered, the officers who had retired with gratuities have not been subjected to any deduction on account of the income derived by them from such gratuities; and will steps be taken to place both categories of officers on an equal footing as regards recompense for the services they have performed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) In reply to the first paragraph, these officers generally are not so eligible with the exception of a few who retired with vested rights. The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative, with the proviso that by the extra service the officer comes into another gratuitable period. The reply to the third paragraph is in the affirmative. I must remind my hon. and gallant friend that the deductions hitherto made from the pay of the re-employed officers who retired on a gratuity were suspended during the war, but following other precedents in the public service pensions are suspended on an officer reverting to full pay.

1st Inniskilling Fusiliers—Return Home.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, looking to the continued service in South Africa, dating from December, 1899, of the 1st Battalion Inniskilling Fusiliers, and its loss in action of twelve officers and 192 non-commissioned officers and men, and also in view of the fact that the 2nd Battalion of the regiment is in South

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cvii., 944.

Africa, he will consider the possibility of removing the 1st Battalion to a home station.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) This battalion will be brought home in its turn from South Africa as soon as it can be spared.

Extra War Gratuity—Participation by Officers.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say why officers were not permitted to participate in the extra war gratuity granted to the warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men under an Army Order issued in January, 1902; and if there is any precedent in previous campaigns where officers were excluded from participating with their men in war gratuities.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) It was held that in view of the prolonged detention of the reservists in South Africa, and of the fact that the soldiers of the regular forces were serving side by side with men drawing considerably higher rates of pay, inadequate provision had been made for the war gratuity to the warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men. The same reasons did not apply to officers.

Officers Serving Abroad—Exemptions from Income Tax.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consider the claims of officers of His Majesty's Naval and Military Services to exemption from income tax when serving abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) Officers in the service of the Crown, Naval, Military, or Civil, are by the Income Tax Acts, chargeable with income tax on their salaries paid out of Votes whether serving at home or abroad. This has always been the case, and I see no reason for making any change.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

War Rewards for Volunteer Officers.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to give the number of officers who served with Volunteer companies and Engineer detachments in South Africa, and who were mentioned in despatches and received rewards.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Thirty-eight officers of the volunteer companies and engineer detachments were mentioned in despatches and of these four were rewarded.

Civil Surgeons and the War Gratuity.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that civil surgeons employed in South Africa as well as civil veterinary surgeons employed both at home and abroad and not holding commissions receive a gratuity, whether he can explain why civil surgeons who have been employed doing military duty at Home are not entitled to the gratuity.

*LORD STANLEY: The civil surgeons employed in South Africa and civil veterinary surgeons employed at home were engaged under a contract, one of the conditions of which gave them a right to a gratuity of sixty-one days' pay on completion of twelve months' service or cessation of engagement. The civil surgeons employed at home were not engaged on such a contract, were employed purely as civilian surgeons, and therefore have no claim whatever to such gratuity.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Does the noble Lord deny that they are both under the Royal Warrant which was issued in Army Order 186, and which distinctly says "ex-officers or civilians."

*LORD STANLEY: I do not deny anything, but I do say that two separate contracts were made, one of which gave veterinary surgeons sixty-one days' pay, while the other, into which the civil surgeons entered of their own free will, did not give it.

CAPTAIN NORTON: The Secretary for War gave me an answer in an opposite sense some time ago.

Artillery Volunteer Adjutants.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the 1st Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers have not had the services of an adjutant for more than a year; and will he state how many other Artillery Volunteer corps have no adjutants at the present time, and what steps he proposes to take to meet the difficulty, in consideration of the higher efficiency expected from Volunteers.

*LORD STANLEY: The adjutancy of the regiment in question has been vacant for a year, and several other Artillery Volunteer corps have been without adjutants in consequence of the great demand for artillery officers in the recent campaign. Instructions have recently been issued to General Officers commanding to take immediate measures to secure candidates for the vacancies.

Colonial Allowances to Officers Serving in South Africa

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what allowance, if any, it is proposed to grant to officers serving in South Africa to meet the cost of living in that country; and whether, in the event of an increase in the colonial allowance being granted, he will direct that it shall date from the conclusion of hostilities.

LORD STANLEY: The Colonial allowance has been raised to 4s. a day, with effect from the 1st September last. This is an increase of 2s. 6d. on the allowance of 1s. 6d. payable in Cape Colony and Natal before the war.

MR. LLEWELLYN: Does that apply to the South African Constabulary?

LORD STANLEY: That Question should be addressed to the Colonial Office.

South African War Transports.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when it is proposed to complete the Return giving the names, tonnage, &c., of the vessels engaged as transports during the South African War, and whether he will add to the particulars already given the rates of freight paid for the chartering of vessels throughout the war.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): A further Return bringing the information with respect to names, tonnage, &c., up to the 31st October last, has been presented to Parliament. This Return will be continued for the present year in due course. As a rule, it is not considered in the interests of the public service or of the contractors themselves, to publish detailed particulars of prices paid. In the present instance, however, the particulars as to rates of freight have been laid before the Royal Commission charged with enquiry into the conduct of the War, and no doubt any points affecting the public interest arising out of the examination of these particulars will be considered by the Commission in making their Report.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): In order to make the Return complete, will the hon. Gentleman say how many of the vessels were fitted with water-tube boilers?

[No answer was returned.]

Admiralty List of Irish Lights.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the inaccuracy of the description of many of the Irish lights in the Admiralty lists, due to the fact that no allowance has been made for alteration in the variation in recent years; and whether, in view of the importance of these lights to navigators, he will take steps to have the Admiralty lists revised and corrected.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The small differences in the bearings of the sectors of the lights due to the constant alteration in the variation of the compass needle are corrected in the Light Lists from time to time, when the alteration is sufficiently great. It is, however, not absolutely necessary to do this very frequently, for the lines showing the radii, between which the sectors are visible, are always correct on the Admiralty Charts, as they are laid down on them from the

True Meridian; and it is the Chart, and not the Light List, that should be used for navigational purposes.

*MR. LONSDALE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that several accidents have occurred in consequence of the variation of these lights?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. I think if the Admiralty Chart is relied upon for navigational purposes, no accidents will occur.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): The hon. Gentleman suggests that the Admiralty Chart should be relied on, but is he not aware that that Chart is very often an old one, whereas the Light List is issued year by year, and is looked upon as the guide for lights by all seamen?

[No answer was returned.]

Indian Native Army—Promotions of Colonels.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state whether, in administering the new system of promotion of colonels of the Native Army to the rank of generals, consideration will be given to the cases of those colonels whose promotion was stopped under the old system, and who cannot now obtain promotion under the new system unless the new regulations are made to apply as from the date of the expiration of the old system of promotion.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Royal Warrant referred to last Tuesday has stopped the principle of promotion by seniority to the rank of Major-General, and has substituted in its place a system of promotion by selection. Promotion by seniority has therefore ceased, and, having ceased, no claim can be urged by those who under the new system may not be selected.

Scarcity of Employment.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, having regard to the scarcity of employment which now exists in many parts of the country, and the fact that the scarcity usually becomes more general during the winter months, he will consider the advisability of issuing a circular, similar in character to those issued in 1893 and 1895 by the Local Government Board, urging the local authorities to carry out such works of sanitation and local improvement as could be undertaken by those who are in need of employment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The subject referred to in the Question is receiving my careful consideration, and I am taking steps to obtain the best information I can with regard to it. I am not in a position to say that it is expedient to issue at the present moment a circular of the kind suggested, but if I should hereafter find this course to be desirable, I shall not hesitate to adopt it.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): May I ask whether the situation is not aggravated by the wholesale importation of pauper aliens.

MR. WALTER LONG: No, sir, I cannot say I have reason to believe that.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the destitution due to scarcity of employment, the Government will introduce legislation on an early date to empower local authorities, acting either singly or in combination, to make provision for obviating the hardships entailed upon the working class during periods of bad trade.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I may remind the hon. Member that a Committee was appointed in 1895 on this subject, and reported in 1896, and of that Committee the hon. Member was, I believe, a member for a part of the time. It did not find it practicable to make any recommendations for legislation to supply work. The Local Government Board have no evidence of seriously increased destitution or scarcity of employment, though the *Board of Trade Gazette* suggested some recent increase in the number of unemployed.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland): Will the right hon. Gentleman consent to the reappointment of a Committee or Royal Commission to consider what measures are practicable for dealing with this question?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the question is hardly ripe for a second Committee.

Mr. J. A. Kensit.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the proceedings arising out of a public meeting held at Liverpool on 30th August last, in connection with which Mr. J. A. Kensit was bound over to keep the peace in £200 and two sureties of like sum, or in default there months imprisonment, while other persons were bound over in their own recognisances of £5; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Some two months ago the case to which the Hon. Member refers was engaging my almost hourly attention. I then took the action which appeared to me to be right, and in the special circumstances which arose, I advised the release of Mr. Kensit. There is no further action for me to take.

[In answer to a further question by Mr. Sloan, Mr. Akers Douglas said he did not interfere with the action of the stipendiary magistrate. He only acted with regard to the reduction of the sentence.]

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman recommend a reduction of the sentences of bail prisoners in Ireland?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Argentine Cattle Trade.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in view of the fact that the Argentine Government, on his request for securities against the importation of cattle for slaughter into this country from the River Plate, passed a Bill, which came into effect on the 15th of February last, which gave protection against the export of diseased animals of a contagious character from Argentina, and also against the introduction of diseased animals from other countries, he will say what further guarantees he now seeks from the Government at Buenos Ayres, and what stands at present in the way of the admission at Liverpool and Deptford of live cattle for slaughter at those ports, and the corresponding admission into Argentina of our high-class breeding stock.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE (Mr. Hanbury, Preston): There is no connection between the admission of fat cattle from Argentina into this country and the admission into Argentina of our pedigree stock. Our pedigree stock are not admitted into Argentina solely because foot and mouth disease has existed in this country within the last six months. What I have asked of the Argentine Government is to take the same precautions with regard to the importation of store animals into that country as we ourselves take even in the case of fat stock. I am glad to be able to add that the Argentine Government have within the last day or two submitted to Congress a Bill which will bring their law into closer conformity with our own.

Barvas Medical Officer's Report.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state why the annual report of Dr. Ross, the medical officer of health for the parish of Barvas, Island of Lewis, is no longer published in the annual report of the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty.

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): Dr. Ross did not send any special statement on the health of the parish of Barvas during 1901 for publication in the County Report.

Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the arrangement under which the lightkeeper at Tiumpan Head, Island of Lewis, records vessels which are observed to be engaged in illegal trawling in Broad Bay has resulted in a trawler having been convicted of illegal trawling in Broad Bay; and, seeing that the coastguard and lightkeepers have detected other cases of illegal trawling in Broad Bay which have resulted in convictions, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of communicating with the Northern Lighthouse Board with a view to ascertain whether there are any other lighthouses around the coast of Scotland where the practice in force at Tiumpan Head could be adopted.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The statement contained in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question is correct. With regard to the second paragraph, the Secretary for Scotland will consider what other lighthouses are placed in a similarly favourable position for observation, and will then communicate with the Northern Lighthouse Commissioners. It is, however, questionable whether they would hold a general extension of the arrangement referred to, compatible with the interests of service, which must be their first charge.

Shader (Island of Lewis) Landing Place.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will state the cause of the delay in the construction of a landing place at Shader, in the Point district of the Island of Lewis, in aid of which the Congested Districts Board provided a grant of £270 on 4th June, 1901; and, in view of the demand of the people of the district for this work, and of the fact that they have offered free labour, will efforts be made to have it completed at an early date.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The delay in taking advantage of the proposed grant by the Congested Districts Board is due to the failure of the County Council to take advantage of the grant intimated by that Board and proceed with the work. Unless the County Council move in the matter very soon, the offer of the grant may have to be withdrawn.

Bagnalstown Police.

MR. TULLY I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether instructions have been issued to the Royal Irish Constabulary in Bagnalstown to comply with Section 12, sub-Section (2), of the Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act in the case of the service of summons at the suit of the Town Commissioners.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): On the 19th instant I informed the hon. Member for South Meath that summonses in cases in which the Town Commissioners of Bagnalstown were the complainants had hitherto been served by the police in order to convenience the Commissioners. The police have been instructed that henceforth such summonses should be served by the officer of the Commissoners.

Banbridge Board of Guardians.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the conviction of two men, named Campbell and Leary, at Banbridge Petty Sessions, by two local justices, who had ordered the prosecution as members of the Banbridge Board of Guardians; and whether, seeing that the defendants have not been imprisoned, he will state what action he proposes to take in this case.

MR. ATKINSON: The proceedings in this case were instituted by the Banbridge Board of Guardians, not by the Crown. The conviction was subsequently quashed and the accused were discharged from custody. As Campbell was in custody under the illegal conviction for sixteen days and Leary for eleven, it was not thought necessary to institute a second prosecution at the suit of the police.

MR. TULLY: Will not the justices who maliciously got these men imprisoned be removed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Longford Guardians—Boarding-out Dispute.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been directed to the action of the Longford

Board of Guardians in terminating with Jane Devine, of Longford, a boarding-out contract for the maintenance of three children, because she refused to change her religion when summoned before the meeting of the Guardians; and whether he can state what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Guardians are taking legal proceedings to compel Jane Devine to surrender to them the custody of these children. I am precluded, therefore, from discussing the merits of the case.

Horse-breeding Experiments in Ireland.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the particulars of the expenditure on experiments in horse breeding were omitted from the last two Reports of the Congested Districts Board; and will he state how much has been spent by this Board on highly-bred stallions in congested districts during the last two years.

MR. WYNDHAM: The amount expended in horse-breeding during the past two years is shown in Appendix IV. to the Board's Annual Reports. The expenditure for the period, deducting receipts, was £7,329.

Irish Congested Districts Board Staff.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give a Return of the number of officials and clerks on the staff of the Irish Congested Districts Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: Forty-nine persons are employed at the Central Office. There are seventeen inspectors and engineers employed in the congested districts, in addition to instructors in agriculture, fishing, lace-making, and clerks of works, coopers, etc.

Corkly Orange Lodge.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the members of the Corkly Orange Lodge visited Keady on 5th November and 17th November, and after partaking of refreshment at a local public-house proceeded on both occasions to fire shots adjacent to the residence of the Christian Brothers; will he state what policemen were present on these occasions; and what action is proposed to be taken against the parties discharging firearms on the public road

MR. WYNDHAM: Some shots were fired on the 5th November, but not near the residence of the Christian Brothers. The police who accompanied the band were unable to detect by whom the shots were fired owing to the darkness of the night. The police are pursuing their inquiries. No shots were fired on the 17th November.

MR. TULLY: Why were not these men prosecuted for unlawful assembly under the Crimes Act?

[No answer was returned.]

Belfast Telegraphists' Grievances.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that, when assistance was required recently in the offices of the Superintending Engineer, Postal Telegraphs, Belfast, it was obtained from Mullingar and Ballina staffs, and that the applications of Belfast telegraphists possessing the necessary qualifications were refused on the grounds of pressure of work in the commercial branch; and whether, seeing that season substitutes were dismissed for lack of work, he will explain why the applications of the local staff were refused.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I find, on inquiry, that telegraphists possessing the necessary qualifications could not be spared from the Belfast Post Office to assist in the office of the superintending engineer during the recent season. I ought, perhaps, to add that the local staff have no claim to a monopoly of this work to the exclusion of all other Post Office servants.

Railway Rates between Limerick and Liverpool.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the complaint of the President of the Limerick Chamber of Commerce that the Great Southern and Western Railway Company have made their through rates between Limerick and Liverpool higher by Dublin than by Cork or Waterford, and have refused through rates by Dublin to intermediate stations; and will he state what action he proposes to take in this matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir, the complaint referred to has not been addressed to the Board of Trade. With regard to the last part of the Question, I may remind the hon. Member that the Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Act, 1900, provides, in Section 34, that reasonable facilities shall be given to induce traffic to pass to, from, and *via* Dublin, and that any case of dispute shall be settled by an arbitrator, appointed by the Board of Trade, on the application of any of the parties authorised by the Section to make one.

MR. TULLY: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any application for the appointment of an arbitrator?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

Army Contracts in Belfast.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state on what grounds the contract for supplying bread to the Victoria Barracks, Belfast, and the Hollywood Barracks, County Down, was given to a firm of wholesale druggists and chemists in Corporation Street, Belfast; and whether, seeing that this firm, being non-bakers, will have to sublet the contract, he will state what steps he proposes to take in this matter.

LORD STANLEY: These contracts were arranged, as all bread contracts are, by the General Officer commanding the district. The firm in question was selected as their offer was the lowest in the competition. Inquiries will be made as to subletting.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that only one day's sittings were allowed for discussion of the Brussels Sugar Convention and in view of the number of Members on both sides of the House who still desire to speak upon it, the Government can see its way to introduce the Bill for the ratification of the Convention during the present session, in order that a further opportunity for discussion may be given before the obligations which the Convention will impose upon this country are entered into.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I ask the First Lord, in view of the fact that many Members—among them myself—desire to speak on this subject, to consider whether it would not be preferable that the Convention should be discussed, not in this sitting of the House, but in the next session, when there will be more time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No doubt, as my hon. friend suggests, there will be an opportunity of discussing the principle of the Convention in connection with the Bill which it will be the duty of the Government to bring in. As regards the Question on the Paper in the name of the hon. Gentleman opposite, I have to say, what can be no matter of surprise to the House, that the business which we have to get through before the House is prorogued is of so pressing a character that I do not think it possible to give any additional time for the discussion of the Resolution which was passed the other day.

MR. LOUGH: Will this opportunity for further discussion be given before the ratification of the treaty takes place?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I think not.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Will reasonable facilities be afforded to hon. Members on both sides for the discussion of the Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What my right hon. friend is asking is that I should give some account of the business of next session, in regard to a Bill not yet introduced. I should regret any curtailment of the amount of debate which hon. Gentlemen desire, but I can give no specific pledge

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I hope it will not be closured on the first night.

Education Bill—Position of Transferred Schools.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will provide in the schedule of the Education Bill for the repeal of Section 24 of the Act of 1870, or in any other way secure that schools transferred by a denomination to a School Board shall not be retransferred after the passing of this Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have answered several Questions as to this. My own view is that where a school is handed back to the voluntary managers, they shall not have the right, and the local authority shall not have the right, to decide offhand which class of school it shall be. Under the provisions of Clauses 9 and 10 the matter must be referred to the Board of Education.

Education Bill—Clause 23.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to insert words in Clause 23, sub-Section (2) of the Education Bill, allowing the local authority discretion to retain a scholar beyond the age of fifteen in a public elementary school when, in its opinion, there is no proper provision for higher education in the immediate district in which the elementary school is situated.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman will find on the Order Paper of the House an Amendment in the name of my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education. It was put down last night, and I hope it will meet the case. The words to be added at the end of Clause 23 are—

> "Provided that the local education authority may, with the consent of the Board of Education, extend those limits in the case of any such school if no suitable higher education is available within a reasonable distance of that school."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I proposed to ask the right hon. Gentleman the day after tomorrow, but it will be convenient perhaps for him to answer now, whether he will reconsider the drafting of Clause 23, as it is extremely obscure. I wished to know whether the intention is that in a parish where the public elementary school is so distant from any secondary school as to be inaccessible to the children of the parish, there should be power to give instruction of an elementary character in the evening schools to persons above the age of fifteen. That is what ought to be made clear, as well as the question of how, under the Bill, higher education is to be made available for children in parishes thus situated. I believe that to be the intention of Clause 23, but the wording is not sufficiently clear, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will agree to alter it, either here or in another place.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman was good enough to call my attention to this matter last night, and I have put down an Amendment to meet the point. I have here Clause 23 as we propose to amend it. [The right hon. Gentleman read the re-drafted Clause.]

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked how, under that Clause, the children in rural schools distant from a central school were to get higher education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is provided for in the Amendment which I read in answer to the hon. Member for North Camberwell.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I shall divide the House against the first of the new Amendments to Clause 23, of which notice was given by the Government this morning, limiting the definition of elementary education and also against the later words extending the trust deeds.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I ask whether the scheme——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Clause has been read, but hon. Members are not entitled to discuss it now.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will the right hon. Gentleman promise not to put down further Amendments today or tomorrow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I cannot make such a promise. This Amendment was put down largely in consequence of a Question addressed to me by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and of another Question which the right hon. Member for West Monmouth showed me yesterday. It would have been a serious loss to those Gentlemen and to the House if I had not met their representations.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: As the House meets at twelve tomorrow, will the right hon. Gentleman abstain from putting down any more Amendments unless he can show them to us today?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will do my best to make the right hon. Gentleman acquainted with them, but manuscript Amendments are not excluded by the practice of the House, and they are, indeed, largely availed of by unofficial Members. Therefore I can give no pledge.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of inserting in the Schedule provisions for the protection of voluntary school teachers, similar to those already inserted with regard to board school teachers?

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): Such a Question as that cannot be answered without notice.

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL.

The Select Committee on the Osborne Estate Bill was nominated of — Mr. Hayes-Fisher, Mr. Solicitor General, and Sir James Woodhouse.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) moved, as a drafting Amendment, to omit from Clause 7, page 4, lines 15 and 16, the words, "without reference to religious creed or denomination."

The Amendment was agreed to.

*(2.45. MR. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) moved as an Amendment to Clause 7: "To leave out of sub-Section (*d*) the words, 'except for the teacher's dwelling-house.'" He pointed out that the ratepayers had been promised the valuable asset that the managers would supply the school fabrics free of cost, and it was only an afterthought on the part of the Government to charge rent for the teacher's dwelling-house, and thus cast this additional burden on the public. The managers had secured a preponderance o: two to one on the management committee, and now it was proposed to let them escape the payment which the people had been promised. This arrangement would work very unfairly in practice, as he would show by citing the cases of two schools well known to him in adjoining parishes. One school had a handsome endowment, a substantial grant, and a good school building, and by this Bill it would be able to charge the ratepayers for its teacher's house, and thus not only relieve its parish rate but accumulate a reserve fund. The other school had no teacher's house, no tithe, and shared a clergyman with another parish, and would therefore have to provide a house for its own teacher, but in addition to these misfortunes it would have to contribute in rates towards paying for the use of the teacher's house of the other school. Then take the case of an adjoining town, where long ago men with real zeal for education built British and National schools. The British school was long ago absorbed in the School Board. The building founded by voluntary gifts became public property. No rent was paid for any part of those buildings;

but the more prudent managers of the National school had had the wisdom to keep the fabric in their hands. He thought the scholars might have before them in letters of gold the legend "Never give anything away." Wait long enough and you might get rent. The managers of the voluntary schools would now be able to charge the public rent. The foundation managers were to have a two to one majority in the control of the schools, and they could under the Bill teach their doctrines at the public cost. Would they give up nothing for the privilege they had gained in teaching boys and girls the bitter differences of sectarian doctrine, differences almost unknown in the House, but confined in the country to parsons and old maids who would practically rule the parish committees? The difficulty of the Church was that it did not call for enough self-sacrifice on the part of its members. The Nonconformist, on the other hand, thrived on self-help. He loved the village chapel because he had paid for so much of it himself. Everything about it reminded him of some little self-sacrifice. Perhaps it might be the spirit of the times, but the Church could now declare that its religion was cheaper than ever. If people wanted cheap religion let them go to the Church of England. He thought, however, the Church of England made a great mistake in bargaining for rent for these schoolhouses. The ratepayers would resent the extra cost they were called upon to pay for the teachers' houses, and the only thing he could hope for was that Churchmen themselves would be more generous than the Government and would grant the buildings for education free and without charge for any part.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.—

"In page 4, line 18, to leave out the words 'except for the teacher's dwelling-house.'"—(*Mr. Frederick Wilson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the hon. Member had dwelt on the time-worn subject of the alleged bargain which had been made at some unknown time with some unknown persons, whom he described generally as the British nation and the supporters of voluntary schools. He entirely denied the existence of any such bargain, though he assumed that the hon. Member referred to the general scheme of the Bill as presented to the House last May. That general scheme dealt with various things which were to be done by the managers, and with other things to be done by the local education authority. The managers were to provide the buildings, and the local education authority was to provide, among other things, the salaries of the teachers. There could be no doubt that the teacher's dwelling was part of the salary of the teacher; and if, therefore, the managers supplied part of the salary of the teacher they were entitled to call upon the local education authority — admitting a bargain, which he did not— in the strictest terms of that bargain, to demand that the rent should be paid and that the local education authority should do what it had always undertaken to do —namely, to provide the cost of the teaching in the school. If, therefore, there was a bargain, the words in the Bill would now carry it out. The objection to rent being paid was that the managers would thereby be assisted in maintaining the fabric in repair. Again and again hon. Members had dwelt on the iniquity of the managers receiving any assistance towards the maintenance of the fabric from any sources of revenue except that of private subscriptions. Surely every one would admit that an educational purpose was served by the maintenance of the schoolhouse in a good condition of repair. When they started a school in any locality the first thing to be done was to build a schoolhouse. But hon. Members said that they did not wish the managers to have any assistance; they were more anxious evidently to put them to their last resources in the way of voluntary contributions, so that the school might fall on the rates He doubted whether it would be the view either of the County Council or the minor local authorities, who would find a serious pecuniary charge thrown on them if the non-provided schools should rapidly become provided schools with the cost of maintaining the fabric thrown on the local education authority. It was to the educational advantage of the whole area that the legitimate sources of income that came to the managers, other than contributions, should be allowed to come freely into their hands to maintain the buildings for the reception of the children and the educational purposes of the area. Therefore, if there had been a bargain, that was a part of the fair terms of the bargain, inasmuch as the local authority had to provide what was a part of the teacher's salary. It was an equitable construction of the arrangement between the local education authority and the managers. The hon. Member said that this was a hard bargain to drive, and used a number of harsh words which he would not recapitulate, but would merely describe as dyslogistic. He should be disposed to carry the war into the enemy's camp. The local education authority was charged with the duty of providing for the education of the whole area; it was bound to find buildings as well as to provide education for the children. Fortunately for the local authority the buildings were found ready to its hand. Surely there was an element of parsimony, or perhaps he should rather say of extreme economy, on the part of the local education authority if it grudged to the managers the sum which was fairly due from it as part of the salary of the teacher and for the maintenance and efficiency of the school. He did not believe that the County Councils and the other local education authorities would be so parsimonious or so grudging as hon. Members opposite were on their behalf.

(3.0.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said that from the beginning of this Bill until the question of teachers' houses was raised, it was thoroughly understood in the country that the Government gave all these extraordinary powers to voluntary school managers on the condition that the buildings of the schools were to be kept up by them, and also everything that was necessary to carry on the schools. Surely teachers' houses were necessary to carry on the schools, and everybody understood that the declaration of the Government on this subject was that the maintenance of the schools other than the buildings was to be borne by the ratepayers, but that the expenses of the buildings should be borne by the managers and subscribers. He would not use the classical word employed by the Secretary to the Board of Education, but he thought the word "shabby" was the plain English, in the vulgar tongue, to describe this miserable attempt on the part of a great richly-endowed Church to throw off its contribution in respect of which it received this inordinate gift of a monopoly, and cast it upon the ratepayers. That was the whole transaction. The teacher's house was part of the school building, and to advertise these buildings in the county newspapers to be let to the highest bidder, was one of the most degrading transactions he ever heard. Was it possible that these houses would be let to anybody but the school teachers? The teacher's house was as much a part of the school building as any one of the class-rooms, and he could not understand how any man in his senses could suppose that in a country parish where the squire and the parson were in charge of these buildings, they should be able to say to anyone, "Give us £20 a year and you shall have the schoolmaster's house." He could not understand how such a transaction could commend itself to the mind of anyone. The Secretary to the Board of Education had just stated that he would carry the war into the enemy's camp. Therefore the process they had been going through in the last few weeks was the most humiliating one of endeavouring to cut off 1s. here and 6d. there from the subscribers in order to cast upon the ratepayers burdens which the supporters of voluntary schools should bear. He did not know what view hon. Gentlemen opposite would take of the light this would throw upon the Church of England. He did not think it would be an elevated position for the Church of England to take up in this matter to say that if they could get £5 here and £15 there then they would do so and make the ratepayers pay it. If all they gained by this was to shift on to the ratepayers what might amount to a half-penny rate, the Church of England would have sold its birthright for a very wretched mess of pottage. He should support the Amendment of his hon. friend. Even now he hoped the House would not support a transaction of this character, which he must say did not show itself to the advantage of the parties by whom it was demanded.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said the extraordinary thing was that hon. Gentlemen opposite always talked about the Church of England and these voluntary schools as if the managers of those schools wished to get rid of their liabilities at the expense of the public. Those who represented large town constituencies knew that there was a very different phase to this subject. A large number of these schools were situated amongst poor populations with no large funds to draw upon and few rich people to contribute, and it was only with great difficulty, and because they were dear to the people who sent their children to them, that they wer eable to keep going, for there was often a free board school next door. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman opposite was taking a very comprehensive view when he spoke as if voluntary schools were only where there were rich people to maintain them. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of an understanding. He had heard before of understandings which were assumed by one side of which the other side had no knowledge. It was quite true that the Government had made largely increased provision out of the Exchequer for necessitous schools of all kinds, as well as charging the rates with the maintenance of voluntary schools, but the funds hitherto paid to the managers of voluntary schools would be paid to the local authority, and could only be paid out for specific purposes, and voluntary schools which had kept themselves going by the goodness of their education and charging fees, would now be thrown back upon private resources to meet the expenses which were thrown upon them by this Bill. It was only through the excellence of their teaching that they had been able to carry on. In Lancashire more money per head was earned by these schools than by the board schools, taking them all round, but now they would have to find other sources. The voluntary schools had to consider every £5 note, and if the schoolmaster had been paid at a lower salary, with a house, than that paid in the board schools, clearly that was part of his income, because it saved him a rent. Under these circumstances, why was that rent not to be reckoned along with the cost of maintenance of voluntary schools? He was not in the least afraid that his constituents would call this a shabby claim.

(3.10.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said the right hon. Baronet had intimated that he had no knowledge of the understanding which had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. He would remind the House that the Bill as originally drafted drew no distinction at all between the teachers' houses and the school buildings, and the understanding was that it included all those buildings. Therefore the change made must have been the result of pressure brought to bear since the Bill was introduced, for this was a clear departure from anything that was arrived at when the Bill was first drafted. The right hon. Baronet said that the voluntary schools must consider every £5 note. He thought they were doing this, and they were managing to extract at the same time many £5 notes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. He was glad that this practice was going to come to an end, because, with a few more days of Closure, heaven knew how many more £5 notes might be extracted. The right hon. Baronet said these school-houses were in very poor districts, and he gave that as a reason why the rent should be charged. He appeared to forget that it was those very districts which would have to pay the rent. This was a most extraordinary argument. If these school-houses were in very poor districts, that was the very reason why they should not charge a rent for them. Under this Bill the rent would fall upon that particular area, and if these houses were built for educational purposes why should they charge the ratepayers with this rent? The right hon. Baronet knew that the difficulty in those poor districts was because of their poverty, and the rates ran up to a very high amount. Those were things they could not avoid Those poor districts were the places where the voluntary schools were going to "look after every £5 note," and they were going to take it from the ratepayers. Might he make one comment on the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education? The effect of the Closure on the Bill was bad enough, but it was nothing compared to the bad influence it had seemed to have on the hon. Member. Entrenched behind the guillotine, with the protection of that potent instrument, he hurled defiance at them and made most aggressive challenges. His speeches formerly were conciliatory—he would not say apologetic, but he used to be purely on the defensive. Now he carried the war into the enemy's camp, and he had done it very effectually. He had captured altogether £200,000, and given it to the voluntary school managers. He had captured half the endowments; and—really he ought to deplore this guillotine business, for it had not improved his Ministerial manner—he attacked the Opposition as if they were the people who were getting the £200,000, and not his friends. What about the grant of £250,000 out of public funds to build the school-houses? The term "shabby" was not strong enough to apply to this matter. The managers were going to charge the very people who gave that £250,000, interest at the rate of 5 per cent. for the money. That was a most impudent proposal; he thought that "impudent" was the epithet which was most applicable, with every desire to be moderate. The Bill was getting worse and worse. He trembled for the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. It had cost them £400,000 a year already. Nay, it had cost them more; the Parliamentary grant-in-aid went up to £500,000 as a result. The endowments were given; school fees were given; and they had to pay rent for the teachers' houses. Mr. Kenyon-Slaney had no idea of the burden he had thrown upon his country. It was a most valuable Amendment, but he did not think its capital value was worth £20,000,000. Luckily, the House of Lords had no power to impose changes in taxation, otherwise the prophecy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he might take something off the income-tax would be a very futile one. If this went on there would be 2d. put on the income-tax.

*MR. GROVES (Salford, S.) said he failed to see that the provisions of the Bill warranted the expressions that had been used towards them by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs, and even after the brilliant speech just delivered he failed to see that this Clause dealing with the rents of teachers' houses should have applied to it the epithets which were employed. In coming to a conclusion on a matter of this kind, every one on his side of the House was disposed to give fair consideration to even the minutest proposals of the Bill. There were places where teachers' houses were provided, and others where houses were not provided. He knew of a school in the parish of St. Bartholemew's, Salford, in his own constituency, where there was no teacher's house, and another school in the same parish where there was an adequate house. In one case the education authority obtained the use of the school, and had to provide a house for the teacher at their own cost. Why should they object to pay for the house already attached to the other school in the same parish? The hon. Member had referred in terms of contempt to the poor districts.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not refer in terms of contempt to the poor districts.

*MR. GROVES said that the poorer the district the stronger the argument in favour of this proposal. He was not convinced by any argument which had been advanced from the other side of the House that there would be any injustice in charging rent for the teachers' houses already existing, seeing that the education authority would have to provide houses where there were none at present, or pay a proportionately higher salary.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) asked on what basis the rent was going to be charged. Most of the teachers' houses existed or, at any rate, a very large part of them, in the small country villages, where there was very often no other house within a mile or two which was good enough for a teacher's house. He instanced the case of the village in Northumberland with which his family was connected. There was a British school in that village, and the teacher's house formed part of the school building. If there were two doors to these village schools, one led to the teacher's house. The teachers' houses were indistinguishable from the school buildings, which were now to be handed over to the local authorities. Practically all the houses in the village were unfitted to be a teacher's house or were occupied. What was to prevent his father, if he chose, from exacting a monopoly rent far above the value of that house? It had a monopoly value in that district. It was not business to put it into the hands of the private owners and Church owners of these houses to charge what rent they pleased for, perhaps, the only house for miles round in which the teacher could probably get decent lodgings. This was far worse because of what the hon. Member for Carnarvon had pointed out, for these dwellings had been largely built out of public grants. For the last three-quarters of a century the nation had been helping to build these houses. During the period when the voluntary schools were being built with greatest rapidity—between 1861 and 1881—1,680 houses were built with the considerable assistance of £65 for the house in each case. That was to say, they were putting into the hands of the Church the power in many cases of charging rent probably above the real value of a building, although the building had been built very largely out of public funds. He thought that was a serious consideration. It proved to the full what was the system the Government had chosen to adopt. If they were going to adopt it he should like to know what they were going to do where houses had practically a monopoly value. Were they going to put something into the Bill which would give some control over, possibly, the exorbitant demands of some of the owners?

*MR. PURVIS (Peterborough) said he would not deal with the epithets hurled from the other side, such as "shabby," "extortionate," and so forth, because it would generally be found that those who wished to drive an extortionate and shabby bargain were those who used extravagant language to the other side. If the teacher had a house provided at the expense of the school managers, then where there was no house, according to the same reasoning they ought to make up their minds that the managers should pay for the teacher's lodgings. Surely that was going beyond the original *concordat.* He believed it was beyond the general scheme of the Bill. The scheme of the Bill was that the managers should not be expected to pay for the lodgings of the teacher. If they were going to pay for his lodgings they would have to pay for his books, school pencils, and other things. If they allowed that the teacher should have a house provided for him by them where there was no house, they would have to make up their minds to provide far more than that.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) observed that the hon. Gentleman had said with great truth and force that this proposal that rent should be charged for the teacher's house was contrary to the scheme of the Bill.

*MR. PURVIS: No.

MR. BRYCE said he heard words to that effect, and he took the words as expressing the truth. The scheme of the Bill was that the managers were to provide the dwellings for the teachers. That was to say, the school building included the school house where there was a school house, because by the Act of 1870, which was incorporated with this Bill, the school house building included the premises of the teacher. The Bill was brought in on that footing, and it was understood that the teachers' residences, as well as the school houses, were provided by the managers. The proposal that the managers should be enabled to charge rent for the teacher's residence was entirely contrary to that scheme, because, by the way in which this Bill had been frequently expounded, the teacher was to be appointed and dismissed by the managers and not by the local authority. He went a little further than the hon. Gentleman, because he held that not only the school premises but the school teacher's house were held upon trust. What was the object of that trust? It was that the house should be enjoyed and occupied by the teacher of the school, as teacher. That was a trust which they were not entitled to break. While that trust stood the managers could not let the schoolmaster's house. They had no power to do so. The house could not be used for any other purpose except for a residence for the teacher, and therefore it was not in the market for the purpose of charging a rent. Looking at it from a strictly legal point of view—as, no doubt, hon. Members opposite would wish to look at it—it was perfectly clear that this proposal to charge rent was not in the original scheme of the Bill, but only introduced when the Government were laid under pressure. And yet the answer of the Secretary to the Board of Education was that it would be an advantage that this charge for rent should be given to the managers and the cost thrown upon the ratepayers! It was to be to the benefit of the ratepayers that they were to pay the rent which otherwise the managers would have paid! He entirely failed to follow that argument.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the local authority would have to provide the school and the teacher's house if the managers did not provide them.

MR. BRYCE said that the managers kept the monopoly. They could not use the house for any other purpose because it was affected by the trust, or they would commit a breach of trust. They talked about bargains; but it must occur to most hon. Members who had watched the changes made in the Bill that a very good bargain had been made for the Church. The Church had got a large share of the endowments, a large share of the fees, and a rent for the schoolmaster's house. That was the result of the hard bargain which the Church Party had driven with the Government. Whether it was a good bargain in a political sense time would show.

(3.38.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he was not disposed to enter at any length into this controversy, beyond saying that the arrangement for charging rent for the teacher's house seemed to him to be perfectly fair and equitable. One could not stroll into the House without being struck with the fact that there was a chorus constantly going on on the Opposition Benches thanking heaven that they were not as those other men—extortioners and unjust. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire professed to translate the adjective used by his hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education; but he must admit that the right hon. Gentleman's own Anglo-Saxon was sufficiently expressive. The argument by which the right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to support that adjective was the most extraordinary he had ever heard. Was it not perfectly clear to every one that if a teacher did not have a dwelling-house supplied to him he would get more salary? The right hon. Gentleman actually said: "Whoever heard that the amount of salary depended on whether a house was supplied for the teacher or not?" The right hon. Gentleman laid down the proposition that the salary given to the teacher depended on his qualifications, and would not be affected in the slightest degree if he got a house or had to provide a house for himself out of his salary. That argument required no comment whatever. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen said that there was a legal difficulty. He confessed that he did not follow the legal difficulty. It was perfectly true that the buildings were held in trust for the purposes of education; but suppose that there was a part of the buildings which was not wanted for the moment for educational purposes, what was to prevent the trustees letting it and applying the proceeds to the purposes of the trust?"

MR. BRYCE said that the object of the trust was designated in the trust deed.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the buildings were applied generally for the purposes of education, and the local authority was the body which was bound to provide a salary to the teacher. He contended that a rent might be charged for the schoolmaster's house, but that the managers were bound to apply the proceeds within the terms of the trust.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that according to a Return given to the House no less a sum than £250000 had been paid out of the Exchequer for building grants for teachers' houses. Would the power to charge rent include those houses which were built, in whole or in part, out of public money ?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not see how that affected the question. The money was granted for the purposes of providing buildings for educational purposes ; and as long as the proceeds of the rent were applied to public purposes within the terms of the trust, he failed to see how the hon. Member's question affected the matter.

MR. WHITLEY asked if he was correct in assuming that the Attorney General meant that the rent was to be applied to public purposes and not to the purposes of the denomination ? It was a revelation that the public were to be required to pay a rent for a building built out of money provided by the public themselves. There was not even a deduction to be made from the rent corresponding to the amount of money contributed out of the Exchequer. It was quite clear from the Return to which he had referred that there were 3,200 teachers' houses, which had been partly provided out of public money, or at the rate of £65 a piece. Hon. Members who were acquainted with the rural districts knew that that represented one-half the cost ; and yet they were told that the public were to pay for ever rent on the money which they themselves had provided.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) said he thought there was another point which ought to be taken into consideration. This Clause, if passed in its present form, would create difficulties and injustice in many rural districts in the country, if the whole of the rents of the non-provided schoolmasters' residences were to come out of the county rates. In the county which he represented there were fifteen School Board districts, and in each of those parishes the School Board had already provided a house for the schoomaster : but under this Bill each of these parishes would have to pay, through the county rate, the cost of the rent of the voluntary schoolmasters' residences, while at the same time they had in their own parishes paid the principal and interest of the cost of their schoolmasters' houses. He believed that, in fairness and justice, if this Clause was passed, the Government should provide that the county rate should get the benefit of the rent in those parishes which had already provided schoolmasters' residences. He trusted this matter would be taken into consideration, and that some alleviation would be made so far as the rural School Board districts were concerned.

*MR. KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood) said he was entirely against the Amendment. But he should like to say that some exception should be made in regard to the schoolmasters' houses which had been built and partly paid for out of public money. He wanted to be absolutely just in this matter.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that he really had hardly anything to add to what had been said by the Attorney-General. The money was given for the purposes of the trust, and would be applied to the purposes of the trust, namely, the educational advancement of the school. He did not see any injustice in applying the money to the purposes for which it was intended.

MR. LUKE WHITE asked if the hon. Gentleman would reply to the question he had put ?

(3.46.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 179 ; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 588.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold. Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Campbell, RtHn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W(Derbyshire

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary(St.Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't, E.
Hope, J. F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John(Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, RtHonWilliamEdw. H.
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, RtHn Walter(Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Macartney, RtHnW.G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Cann, James
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. JohnP.(Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, HonM. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, RtHn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC(North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson, DrEC(Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia Viscount
Walrond, RtHn. SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, ColonelWilliamGeorge
Welby, Lt.-ColA. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, SirCharlesG. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, RtHn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, SirWilliam(Gateshead)
Allen, CharlesP.(Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHonHerbertHenry
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. CharlesSeale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Middlemore, JohnThrogmort'n
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, SirCharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur

Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 7, page 4, line 20, leave out from 'school' to 'and,' in line 23" "In Clause 7, page 4, line 27, at end, insert as a fresh paragraph—'(*e*) The managers of the school shall, if the local educational authority have no suitable accommodation in schools provided by them, allow that authority to use any room in the schoolhouse out of school hours free of charge for any educational purpose, but this obligation shall not extend to more than three days in the week.'" "In Clause 7, page 4, line 28, after 'school' insert 'maintained but.'" "In Clause 7, page 4, line 28, make lines 28 to 37, being paragraph (*e*) of sub-Section (1), a new sub-Section (2)." "In Clause 7, page 4, line 39, after 'school' insert 'not provided by the authority.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

*(4.5.) MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said he desired to move to omit the Clause inserted by the hon. and gallant Member for the Newton Division in Committee and thought he would be held guiltless of any discourtesy to the hon. and gallant Member if he referred to this Clause as the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. He was anxious at the outset to make his position clear to many of those opposed to this Clause, and therefore he might say it was an entire mistake to suppose, as had been taught on many occasions in this House in matters where the Church of England was interested, that the only party in the Church interested was the High Church party. He did not wish to argue his own views in matters of this sort, but he belonged to the same school as his hon. and gallant friend who moved the insertion of this Clause, that moderate school which disliked extremes and which thought that within the portals of the Church there was room for everyone of a wise and moderate spirit. It seemed to him in this Church question that everyone in the Church was entitled to express his own views so long as he kept within the legal limitations of the National Church, and he deprecatedthe in tolerant spirit which led one extreme party to persecute and ostracise the other. A spirit of that kind would lead to the destruction of the Church, and he disassociated himself entirely from it. In order to show that he did not represent any narrow view within the Church, he might mention he received, two days after the Clause had been passed, a document, signed by no less than 500 clergymen of the Manchester diocese, protesting against it, and anyone who knew the diocese knew perfectly well that the document was signed without any regard to High or Low Church; there were an equal number of clergymen representing both views protesting against what they considered to be an interference with their views and the views of the National Church.

There were three points of view from which he regarded the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. It had been said that this Clause was in the nature of an insult to the Church of England. He did not believe it was either introduced or accepted from any such point of view. He was sure the hon. and gallant Member had no such idea, and that those who supported him had nothing farther from their thoughts. Everyone who loved the Church, and felt that the clergy did their duty, must acknowledge that their position had been recognised again and again in the many speeches made by the First Lord of the Treasury. But although nothing in the nature of an insult was intended, they had to consider, as regarded the practical bearing of this Amendment, what had been the position of the clergy in regard to denominational education in this country. Without hesitation, he laid it down that if it had not been for the self-sacrifice of the clergy a vast number of these denominational schools would not be in existence at the present moment. It was not very much sometimes for the rich man of whom they had heard so much to give out of his abundance for the purposes of education, but he was familiar with many instances where the clergyman, in his desire to maintain what he considered was the true form of denominational teaching, had denied himself and family the necessaries of life, and for this form of self-sacrifice they ought, he submitted, have the respect of every member of the House. (A VOICE: What about the rich archbishops?) There were one or two special directions in which he might emphasise that. He would not go into the poorer districts where the school had been managed and maintained by the country clergyman; he would not go into the slums of the big towns where, so far as the clergy were concerned, the schools had been maintained so ably: he would say a word with regard to his own constituency. It lay between Manchester and Stockport. A few years ago it was a country district—it was covered with buildings, many of them of the poorer class, at the present moment; it was one of the districts where the greatest self-sacrifice was required from the clergymen in order to keep themselves on a level with the population as regarded the schools and the church, and in the spirit of self-sacrifice he knew that the clergy of that district had gone without the necessaries of life in order to carry out what they conscientiously considered to be their duty. Upon the Church question pure and simple, whatever might be the views on one side or the other, the House would be unanimous on this, that it should be the mission of the Church to teach the young children the doctrine on which they believed the great issues of futurity depended. He did not believe the clergy would adopt so unfortunate an attitude as to close these schools on account of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, although anyone could understand the great momentary irritation in a matter of this kind. He had no fear of that, but he feared the slackening of the energy of the clergy. He had the strongest conviction that if there was any slackening of devout energy on the part of the clergy to maintain the denominational character of schools, they would in a number of cases be condemned.

One great objection he had to the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, which was not intended as an insult to the Church, was, if they considered human nature, that the interest in education under the working of this Clause in the future was likely to be slackened. If it was, there could not be a greater misfortune happen to the denominational schools. A further objection to the Clause was that its effect upon the managers would be as bad as its effect on the clergy. One of the reasons why the denominational schools had worked so well and with so little friction was, that in the choice of the managers of those schools the extreme denominational element had been to a great extent excluded. That could not be so in the future if they were to have the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. With regard to present conditions, although he did not care to go into illustrations of a personal nature, in the parish with which he was associated, in a parish in which the Church element had been not only predominant, but almost exclusive, for a long series of years the school had been managed without the slightest friction by a governing body of four Church of England men, two Dissenters, and one Roman Catholic; and until this Bill was brought in, and he inquired as to what the religious convictions of the managers were, he did not know which faith they professed. It was said that the denominational character of these schools would be protected, because there was to be a majority of denominational managers. What did that mean? They introduced into their daily life questions of doctrine and religion. Would it not be absolutely essential in the future, if questions of doctrine and religion were to be determined, to appoint as foundation managers members of the denomination? Under this Clause they could not complain if the people appointed members who were not only members of the denomination, but bigoted members, which would be a most unfortunate result, because it would introduce an intolerant spirit exactly where it ought not to be introduced. He had heard this question argued as though the purport of this Clause was to introduce a larger local and popular element. There could not be a greater mistake or misapprehension. The managers, whether trustees or not of these private schools, outside the two appointed by the local education authority, represented a private interest, and a private interest only. What reason was there to suppose that an individual manager or a particular body of trustees should not be at least as eccentric and extravagant as an individual member of the clergy of the Established Church? It was not a question of popular management on the one side and the clergy on the other, it was a question of whether in some of the parishes questions of doctrine and Church discipline should, instead of being in the hands of the clergyman and bishop, be in the hands of the squire or private owner, who in matters of this kind had no right to be heard at all. [A VOICE: Why not?] His view of denominational education was that it meant denominational education carried on under the superintendence of the ministers of the Church. The point he put was that there was no reason for it on the religious side, and on the practical side there was every reason against giving an individual or his nominees in a particular parish power over the religious teaching which happened to be taught in that parish. The Kenyon-Slaney Clause had nothing to do with the question of popular control. That was dealt with by other Clauses of the Bill. Take a clergyman, no matter what his tenets were, and assume that all his parishioners were in favour of the form of religious education which he taught, and take the owner of the school who at the time was antagonistic to all the parishioners, a man who might be an extreme Churchman. There they had a private owner of a school deciding against the wish of the parish and the religious teacher of the parish—what should be taught in the school.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was only one out of six.

*MR. CRIPPS said it was not one out of six because he appointed the other three practically. He hoped the House would appreciate the fact that they were dealing with a question in which if there was antagonism between the clergyman and the school-owner this is what would occur. Could such a thing be maintained as a fair solution of this difficult problem? What could be worse in its influence, as regarded religious teaching than to have a popular clergyman, with whom all his parishioners agreed, and an unpopular school-owner who was antagonistic and had unpopular views, whose views were to be forced on that parish? There could be no other result if the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment were applied. He did not wish to deal with the religious question, he wished to make it a practical question. It was a monstrous thing to supersede the clergyman in such circumstances, and to substitute for him some private person who had no responsibility to any one.

Another strong objection which he had to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was and he was now going on to more technical grounds, that it had been suggested that this Clause either did not affect the trusts at all, or only affected them in very unimportant details. If the Kenyon-Slaney Clause was to be given any meaning at all, it would and must affect those trusts in future. He made that statement because if hon. Members looked at the Clause, they would see that religious instruction was to be given in the school not in accordance "with the provisions of the trust deed relating thereto." but "in accordance with the tenour of the provisions of the trust deed." Why were those words introduced, and what could they mean? They meant nothing more than this—if it was an Anglican school in the past it would be so in the future, and if it was a Roman Catholic school, or a Wesleyan school, in the past, so it would remain. That would be so without the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. But he thought the real meaning of those words went much further. He put it to the learned Attorney General in order that he might get an answer. He would take a case where the terms of the trust deed at the present time were that the religious education should be carried out according to the tenets of the Church of England. Suppose in that case there was a difference of opinion between the owner of the school, or his nominee, and the clergyman of the parish. Which was to have the government as regarded the religious education? Was it to be in accordance with the tenets of religion in the hands of the rector, or was it to be taken out of the hands of the rector and placed in the hands of others? If it was taken out of the hands of the rector, then they were interfering in the most direct and improper way with the trust deed. If they had a trust deed leaving the religious education to the clergyman of the church, and by the operation of this Clause it was withdrawn from his hands and put into the hands of a body of managers or private individuals, were they not on a most crucial point interfering with the trust. That was a very clear issue. Under these conditions would the teaching be in accordance with the terms of the trust in the hands of the clergyman, or would it be transferred into the hands of the new managing body? He knew there had been some difference of opinion as regarded the construction of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause but the words were "and shall be under the control of the managers." In his opinion that was introducing a new term into every trust deed. Was it intended to be subject to all the provisions which existed in the trust deed at the present time? From his own point of view, if it could be made perfectly clear that no trust deed would be interfered with, and there were facilities for providing trust deeds in the future, he admitted that a very large amount of his objection to this Clause would be done away with. They would then always have trust deeds under which it was inoperative, and in those circumstances they would take the proper course of being governed by the conditions of the deed, outside of any special provisions in the Bill itself.

The effect of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause would be to weaken the interests of the clergy in education and to demoralize the managers. They were now a composite body as regarded denominations, but they would henceforth necessarily be chosen from one denomination, because a member of another denomination could, of course, not be introduced without running the risk of the Church getting into a minority on the question of religious education. Lastly, as a Conservative of a pronounced type in this matter, he protested most strongly against any interference with these trust deeds which was not shown to be absolutely and essentially necessary. The hon. and gallant Member had urged that this Clause would be a means of security against the action of what he called eccentric or extravagant clergymen. But whereas a clergyman was now subject to control, both under the law of the Church and the action of his Bishop, the effect of this Clause might be to put the religious instruction of the children into the hands of quite as eccentric laymen, who in their position as owners of school buildings had no special claim to interfere in this matter of religious doctrine. Surely it was a slur on the clergy in one sense if they assumed that the eccentricity and extravagance must be on their side only. That was not his experience. He had no doubt that they would be able to find exceptions to this rule, but the laity could not claim infallibility on this point any more than the clergy. That seemed to him to be the only argument.

It was an argument of despair to introduce questions of Church discipline into the education of young children. A lay High Churchman might bring a crucifix into a school, and thus oust the clergyman who is a Low Churchman. That was an extraordinary proposition. Suppose there was a clergyman with whom he disagreed. Suppose a Low Churchman found himself face to face with a High Church manager—was it right that he should be excluded from that school and from the religious teaching if such teaching was given within the limitation of what was legal in the Church? What a bathos for the Church of England to have its doctrines put in the hands of four managers selected by individual owners of the school and two who came from the local authority. He was strongly opposed to any ostracising policy either by his hon. and gallant friend or by anyone else of the Church of England, and he bitterly regretted that in a Bill which, in his opinion, was tempered by religious equality all round, and which had gone further than any proposal made before to remedy the disabilities of which Nonconformists complain, and far beyond what was done by the Party in power in 1870, not only in the Bill itself but in the expressions with which it was introduced—he regretted, as a member of the Church of England, that the one instance of intolerance, the one case of a new disability, should have been introduced to the detriment of that class who, by their devoted self-sacrifice, had maintained denominational education up to this day, and without whose devoted self-sacrifice no Act of Parliament could maintain it in future.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out sub-Section (4) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'religious instruction' stand part of the Bill."

(4.38.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he was in entire disagreement with the main point of his hon. and learned friend's speech, but every one must agree with the spirit of the remarks with which he prefaced the more controversial part of that speech. He was not wrong in believing that the Government, in accepting the Amendment moved by his hon. and gallant friend, were acting not in the interests of any party, political or religious, but solely in the interests of the smooth working of the machinery of the new system under the altered conditions which the Bill had introduced. His hon. and learned friend had paid an eloquent and deserved tribute to the work which the clergy had done with reference to education in England. He said, and said truly, that it was to the self-sacrificing exertions of the clergy that in very many cases these schools had owed their continued existence. He might have gone a great deal further and said that at a time in the history of education in England, when there were none to help, the clergy of the Church of England stepped in. He might have further said that for many years, so far as the work of national education was discharged it was discharged by the clergy of the Church of England, and no one in dealing with the educational problem could for one moment leave out that great fact, which lay at the foundation of that which they had now to deal.

When his hon. and learned friend apprehended that the effect of this Amendment would be to lead to some slackening of zeal on the part of the clergy in the Church with regard to education, he did not share that apprehension. He had a far higher opinion of the clergy of the Church of England than that into the expression of which for the moment his hon. friend was betrayed. He did not believe that the clergy of the Church of England were out of sympathy with the laity, or that they would have any difficulty in co-operating with them. He was reluctant to enter into any controversial matters with his hon. and learned friend, but he must demur to one portion of his hon. friend's speech in which he seemed very unduly to minimise the place of the laity in the Church. He did not think that his hon. and learned friend really meant all that his words seemed to convey, but he must protest against the expressions which he used being taken in the full import which the words at the time he used them seemed to bear.

MR. CRIPPS said he thought his words must have been misunderstood. He was not talking about the laity, but he was speaking of the position of the owners of private schools.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the expression to which the hon. Member referred occurred in another portion of his hon. friend's speech. His hon. friend seemed to think also that this Clause would make the managers bigoted. He would have thought that it would have exactly the opposite effect, and that the tendency would rather be to have moderate men on the Board, who fairly represented the laity of the denomination with which the school was connected. His hon. and learned friend gave a very interesting instance from his own experience, where there was a Board of Managers consisting of four members of the Church of England, two Nonconformists and one Catholic. Taking the four members of the Church of England and the two Nonconformists, he apprehended that there could not be any more difficulty under the operation of this Clause in the working of that Board than there would be before this Clause existed.

MR. CRIPPS: The clergyman in this case comes under the trust deed and has control of the religious teaching.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he really could not see why, if a voice was given to the laity with regard to the administration of religious instruction, it should introduce on all Boards the bigotry which his hon. and learned friend had predicted. He hoped and believed that the effect would be exactly the opposite, and that these schools would be worked in a spirit of mutual forbearance with the result of preventing instead of causing bitterness. There was one other observation which he must make with regard to the constitution of the board of management. His hon. and learned friend had compared the case of a school connected with a particular denomination under a trust deed and the case of a school the absolute property of a private owner. Of course, a private owner might shut up his school altogether, but in the case of a school founded under a trust deed in connection with a particular denomination, the state of things was altogether different. There they expected to have a Board of managers of whom the clergyman would generally be one, and the choice of four out of six places would be in the hands of the denomination with which the school was particularly associated. In those circumstances he really could not see how the danger could arise which his hon. and learned friend depicted of a tyrannical squire setting himself up as an ecclesiastical authority and imposing his views on theology on the management, and rejecting those of the clergyman.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) asked whether his hon. and learned friend contemplated that a Roman Catholic could be among the foundation managers.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not contemplate that. Where foundation managers were chosen to represent a denomination, one would expect that he would be a member of that denomination. He did not say there might not be occasional cases in which a gentleman of different views, who was thoroughly well known, whose judgment was implicitly relied on, and who was absolutely worthy of the confidence of the denomination, might be put on the board among the foundation managers. He apprehended that such cases would be extremely rare. Then they were told that there ought to be no interference with the trust deeds. With that sentiment in general he cordially agreed, but regard must be had to the total change of conditions and circumstances, and he was sure his hon. and learned friend would not contend that, if all the conditions were changed, the conditions prescribed in the trust deed should be adhered to inflexibly for all time.

A gloomy picture had been drawn of the doctrines of the Church of England being at the mercy of the managers. He hoped to be able to satisfy the House that that was entirely a fancy picture, and that there was no danger of that kind under the Bill. The Clause had been a good deal discussed, but in order to see clearly what the effect was, one had to look at the Clause as a whole. It consisted of two parts. The first part dealt with—he put it shortly—the nature of the religious teaching to be given; and the second part dealt with the control of the administration with regard to the giving of that teaching. The first part was in these words—

> "Religious instruction shall be given in a public elementary school not provided by the local education authority, in accordance with the tenour of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed relating thereto."

And the second part was—

> "And shall be under the control of the managers."

The first part dealt with doctrine, and the second part with machinery, and he thought that any misconception which had arisen as to the meaning of the Clause had been caused in this way, that those who had endeavoured to construe it had fastened their attention too exclusively either on the first or on the second part. In order to get the true meaning of either part they must read the Clause as a whole, and read each in the light of the other portion, which, by all the rules of commonsense, was the way it must be construed. With regard to the first portion of the Clause, he apprehended that no one could suggest that giving the control of religious teaching to a body of managers empowered them to go outside the terms of the trust deed. If the terms of the trust deed provided for religious teaching according to the doctrines of the Church of England, he apprehended that it was perfectly clear the managers, however much they had control of the teaching, could not by any possibility introduce the teaching of any other religion in the school. They could not in that case introduce Wesleyan or Roman Catholic teaching; they were bound by the terms of the trust as to the nature of the religious instruction to be given in the school. If the trust deed made no provision for determining any questions of difference as to what the doctrine of the Church of England might be, the question in the last resort would have to be determined by the Court of Chancery. As in the case of all other trusts for the application of endowments of any kind, if questions arose as to whether the trust was being carried out according to law, the Court would have to decide. He was glad it did not often come to that, for it was a delicate, anxious, and difficult question for a court of law to have to deal with. The courts would also have to determine any question of that kind when there was no trust deed at all, or if there were any circumstances in which a trust could be implied in favour of the tenets of one denomination or another. But the greatest admirers of the courts of law must confess that there were some questions they were better qualified to deal with than others, and the framers of some trust deeds seemed to have adopted that view because they had provided that cases of difference in relation to ecclesiastical teaching should be determined by some superior ecclesiastical authority. A provision of that kind, if put merely on the low ground of convenience, would be recognised as extremely expedient and as one that ought not to be interfered with. He read the Clause as not interfering in the slightest degree with the functions of any such ecclesiastical authority to determine what the doctrine was of the Church with which the school was associated; and if a question arose as to whether a particular doctrine was a doctrine of the Church of England, then if the trust deed provided for the decision of that point by the bishop his decision would be obtained, and it would be the duty of the managers loyally to carry out the decision of the authority provided by the trust deed of which they were the administrators. That was the way he read the first portion of the Clause on the consideration of which the House was engaged.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Do I understand the Attorney General to mean that the bishop can determine both whether a doctrine is untrue and whether a doctrine should be taught? There are errors of omission as well as errors of commission.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY replied that, speaking generally, the bishop would have jurisdiction over errors of omission as well as over errors of commission, because they might have a doctrine so vital to the tenets of a particular denomination that to leave it out would be as bad as to put in another.

MR. CRIPPS: In a case where at the present time it would be under the rector of the diocese, would that be continued under the Bill, or would it be given to the law courts?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would deal with that presently. The second part of the Clause dealt with the control of the teaching. That was given to the managers. He was asked what would happen if the trust deed provided that the teaching should be under the superintendence of the rector of the parish. In future that superintendence would be subject to the control of the managers. In this was no disrespect, or even suspicion of disrespect, to the clergy of the Church of England. He did not believe that the collision, which his hon. and learned friend apprehended as possible, between the clergyman and the other managers would occur in one case out of a thousand. He had perfect confidence in the ability of the clergy to co-operate with the laity of the Church and with the other managers. But if in the thousandth case there was, unhappily, division as to the manner in which the doctrines of the Church were to be carried out, the last word must rest with some one, and he thought his hon. and learned friend would agree that, in view of the vast changes this Bill involved and the manner in which the schools were to be maintained, the system of one-man management, well as it had, on the whole, worked in the past, was not one the House would desire to continue. His hon. and gallant friend who moved this Amendment had brought forward words which would have the effect of giving the laity a fair voice in saying how the machinery of religious instruction was to work. He had endeavoured to put clearly his views on the Clause. He would only add that he did not think he had said a single thing that had not already been said quite as clearly by the First Lord of the Treasury partly in this House in the debate on the Clause, partly in this House in answer to Questions put the other day, and partly in answer to those innumerable letters with which his right hon. friend had been flooded by those who were anxious as to the working of this Clause. His belief with regard to the Clause, as with regard to any other parts of the Bill, was that all the difficulties which had been conjured up would in practice not be found to exist. He believed the clergyman would retain his legitimate influence, and that he would be well able to co-operate with the laity in the discharge of his great function of seeing that the doctrines of his Church were taught to the children in the schools.

*(5.0.) **Mr. ASQUITH** (Fife, E.): I have placed on the Paper an Amendment which would have the effect of omitting the very words which my hon. and learned friend opposite has proposed to omit in his Motion to reject the Clause as a whole. But our objects are diametrically opposite. My hon. and learned friend wishes to get rid of the Clause. I, although I do not attach as much value and importance to it as so many people are supposed to, wish to retain the Clause, and the object of my Amendment is not only to retain the Clause, but to express what I believe is the unanimous intention of the House—both of those who opposed and those who advocated it three weeks ago—in clear and unequivocal language. I am, however, precluded by the technicalities of our procedure from moving the Amendment, and I will take the issue as upon the Clause in its present form. Now, I listened with great attention and much respect to the speech of the Attorney General, who gave a lucid exposition of the problem he was endeavouring to explain to the House. But I confess that that speech filled me with amazement. I propose to ask the attention of the House to two questions—first of all, What does the Clause mean? and secondly, What was the Clause intended to mean? Now, what does the Clause mean? The Attorney General has told us that it consists of two parts—one of which deals with doctrine and the other with what he somewhat vaguely called control or administration. But it appears that, wherever a school is not managed by a trust deed which gives the power of appeal to the Bishop, the question of doctrine would fall under the category of administration, and the managers would be supreme.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: It would be for a court of law to determine what was the doctrine of the Church in that case.

***Mr. ASQUITH**: In the first instance, the managers are to determine, and if any one likes to go to law and complain of a breach of trust he may do so. But subject to that contingency the managers in all these schools are to be the persons who are to determine the doctrine which is to be taught to the children, and it is only in the schools where the trust deed contains this power of appeal to the Bishop that the managers will be deprived, practically, of any effective voice in the selection of the doctrines to be taught or the manner in which they are to be taught and their powers of administration will be confined to I do not know what—apparently to nothing at all. I confess I should have interpreted the Clause in a totally different sense, although I express the opinion with the utmost diffidence after listening to the speech of the Attorney General. I should have said that the words, "in accordance with the tenour of the provisions of the deed" are purposely chosen. Tenour is not a term of art. It is a totally different thing, and must be intended to have a different significance from "terms," "conditions," "provisions," and, still more, "detailed machinery." I interpret the word "tenour," as I believe it was universally interpreted in the debate of three weeks ago, as meaning that so long as the teaching given is within the general scope and effect of the trust deed—that is to say, that, so long as, as the Attorney General said, in an Anglican school the teaching is Anglican, in a Wesleyan school Wesleyan, and in a Roman Catholic school Roman Catholic—subject to that limitation, the control, the undisputed and undivided control, is with the managers.

We have to consider the Clause as a whole, and we must look to the governing intention of the whole. That is a well-known rule of legal construction, as well as a rule of common sense. What is the governing intention here? I venture to say it is that, provided the teaching given is within the general scope, in other words, in accordance with the tenour of the trust deed, the power, the control, of the managers is supreme. Let me quote the actual language of the ordinary trust deed of the National Society. It is that "the superintendence of the religious instruction to be given in the schools shall be vested in the managers for the time being, and in case of any dispute or difference arising on any matter"—not merely on questions of doctrine—"affecting the religious instruction in the said school, an appeal may be made to the bishop of the diocese, whose decision shall be final, conclusive, and binding on all parties." How a court of law is to say, in one and the same breath, that Parliament gives the control with one hand as regards religious instruction and yet keeps alive a provision which enables the bishop to waive the managers aside, is more than I can comprehend. I confess that, if the matter did come before a court of law, I should have a very confident expectation myself that it would be held that the governing intention of the Clause in such a case was managerial control, and that the provision of the trust deed which appeared to be of the contrary effect must be deemed to be swept aside. Whether this is the actual construction of the Clause or not, I have no hesitation in saying that it was clearly the intention of the Committee when the Clause was discussed and carried by an overwhelming majority. According to the Attorney General, the Committee during the whole of that debate was in a dream, and while it thought, as it undoubtedly did think, that throughout these non-provided schools it was establishing, as regards religious instruction, lay control, it was really, without suspecting it, as regarded a very large number of them, as regarded apparently all of them with trust deeds of the National Society, enthroning by statute the final and undisputed jurisdiction of a remote ecclesiastical authority. What was the intention of those who advocated the Clause? I turn now to the speech of my hon. and gallant friend who is the sponsor of this Clause—a sponsorship which has achieved for him a universal and a universally appreciated celebrity. Was it the object of my hon. and gallant friend, when he moved this Clause, when he talked about the importance of bringing local lay opinion to bear upon, and in restraint of, the eccentricities of the clergyman, that laymen should have no determining voice in the matter, but only the power to say, "We do not approve of your practices, the thing must go to the Bishop." I doubt whether that was his intention. What was the avowed and pronounced object of my hon. and gallant friend?

> "He desired to make it impossible for the future," he said, "that any individual, whether cleric or layman, should be able to impose of his own will, any form of religious teaching, or any practice or observance in connection with religious teaching, which might not have the consent and approval of the majority of the management of the school."

Surely the word "cleric" included not only the local parson, who might be supposed to know the needs of the parish, but also the bishops, far removed from the scene of dispute, and who, as a body, had not shown themselves in the past over zealous to check the exuberance of eccentric and refractory priests.

But equally important is the meaning attributed to the Clause by those who opposed it. I turn to the speech of the hon. Member for Tonbridge. Do not let it be supposed that this question of the trust deed was passed over *sub silentio.* It was pointedly brought to the attention of the House by him. He said, after quoting the terms of the National Society's deed—

> "He did not want to argue that point, because there was an appeal already to a recognised constituted authority; but if this Amendment were carried there was no appeal at all. They might give their decision in accordance with the tenour of the trust deed with no bishop or education authority to see that they did their work properly."

That was the sense in which the opponents of the Clause understood it. It is still more important to see what was the opinion of the Government, for if they had not assented to this Clause its fortunes might have been very different from what they actually were. I take the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury himself. The right hon. Gentleman quoted a passage from a previous speech of his own, in which he used this expression—

> "Religious education will be under the control not of one man, and that man the parson of the parish, but of a board of six. Of these the parson would probably be the only minister of religion, and three would be managers representing the denomination."

The right hon. Gentleman proceeded—

> "It was never contemplated that the teaching in a Roman Catholic school should be other than Roman Catholic, or that the teaching in a Wesleyan school should be other than Wesleyan, or that the teaching in an Anglican school should be other than Anglican; but I must traverse the contention of my noble friend that it was ever contemplated that the teaching should not be under the Board of Management."

He developed the argument to show that the real object for thus associating the Board of Management with the clergyman was that you might bring to bear—no doubt in a rough and approximate and indirect way, but still effectively—on the character and quality and nature of the religious teaching given in the school, the opinion of the parents of the children. He said—

> "I do not pretend to maintain that, in an absolutely theoretic sense, these managers necessarily represent the parents. They are not elected by them, and, therefore, they do not represent them in that sense. But they will represent, broadly speaking, the general opinion of the particular denomination in a parish, and I think that if this Amendment is carried there really will be no danger that Anglican children will be taught a form of religion to which their parents heartily object."

So that the opinion of the First Lord of the Treasury was that they would have the voice, indirect, it was true, of the parent to restrain, if necessary, the eccentricities of the clergyman. What is to become of all that as regards a vast number of schools—they must be numbered by the thousand—in the vital matter which is the object of the Amendment — namely, the clergyman giving religious teaching which might very possibly be within the elastic range of the formularies of the Church of England, as interpreted by the bishops or the courts of law, but which was offensive, and known to be offensive, to the consciences and sentiments of a large number of the parents? How is the object to be attained as regards these thousands of schools where the voice of the managers is, in case of dispute, to be set aside altogether, and the final and unappealable decision is to be given by the bishop and nobody else! What have the managers got to control? What is there left for them to do? It is quite true that they would appoint and dismiss the teachers; but in the sub-Section now before the House they are given express definite authority to control religious teaching. But while that authority is given to them, it is now said they are only to exercise it subject to the veto of the bishops, which is practically taking away with one hand what is given by the other. I will not multiply quotations, but speaker after speaker in this debate, and no one more clearly than the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, agreed as to the effect of the Clause; and when the noble Lord proposed what the Attorney General now says is in the Clause, that the control of the managers should be subject to the provisions of the trust deeds, it was opposed by the First Lord of the Treasury and negatived without a division. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "He did not think the words proposed by his noble friend would do, but the general principle he had laid down would be safeguarded if they put in the following provisio: 'Provided that any power as to religious instruction conferred by the deed on any clergyman or minister of religion shall, subject to such control, remain vested in him.'"

The noble Lord, with that penetration which might be expected of him, said that that would be worse than the hon. and gallant Gentleman's Amendment, as it would expressly provide that the clergyman should be absolutely subject to the control of the managers.

The truth is that the supporters of the Clause, the opponents of the Clause, the Government which accepted the Clause, and the Committee which adopted the Clause—all understood it in the sense which I have described. Why, then, have we got this suggested construction, never put upon it at the time, never dreamt of at the time by a single human being? There had been a storm brewing in ecclesiastical circles, and a bishop of the Church, one of the most distinguished and universally respected of them, the Bishop of Worcester, as soon as this Clause was passed, sounded the note of alarm. The Bishop laid it down as one of the fundamental principles of the Anglican Church, if not of any Episcopal Church, that, as far as the religious teaching was concerned, the clergyman of the parish was to exercise complete and undivided control, subject only to appeal to the bishop of the diocese. It was a doctrine of the Schoolmen that entities ought not to be unnecessarily multiplied, and I venture to think there is nothing more dangerous to a great institution, whether in the Church or State, than unnecessarily to multiply its fundamental principles. And where is this fundamental principle to be found? Where is it? By what authority and to whom has it ever been defined or propounded? I do not know, and I never yet knew anybody who did; but this I know, that if this is going to be regarded for the future as in any sense a fundamental principle of the Church of England, that a clergyman of that Church, whatever his opinion may be, however little he may be in harmony with the average religious sentiment of the parish in which he lives, is to have a complete autocracy as regards the form of religious teaching to be given in his parish—an autocracy which is to be complete, subject only to appeal to the bishop—a complete autocracy as regards the form of religious teaching to be given in a State school—in a school every penny of the remuneration of the teacher in which comes from public funds—if that is going to be recognised as one of the fundamental principles of the Church of England, so much the worse for the future of that Church.

I say then, first of all, and with great deference, that the Clause has not the effect which was now sought to be attributed to it, and it was never intended to have that effect. The very object with which it was brought forward and supported and opposed would be completely frustrated, as regards the great mass of these schools, if the so-called lay control was nothing better than a shadow and a figment, and the practical determination of the religious teaching was to rest with the clergyman, subject to appeal which was difficult to prosecute, and, as past experience shews, not likely in many cases to meet with a favourable reception from the bishop who knew nothing of the local circumstances. Lastly, I maintain that there is involved here, quite apart from the language and intention of this particular Clause, a principle which this House when it adopted the Clause appeared almost without distinction of Party to enunciate and to adopt, a principle which it ought not to abandon, and that principle is this, that in these schools, supported as they will be—so far as the teaching is concerned—entirely by the State, the laity are entitled to a predominant voice in the religious teaching which is given.

(5.23.) COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he was sure he would have the sympathy of the House in being the first layman to take part in the debate that afternoon. He was in the extremely unfortunate position of having to take part in a wrangle between great legal giants holding opposite views. Though he had the great honour of having a Lord Chief Justice of England as a great grandfather, he failed to find that any of his ancestor's legal knowledge had descended to him; and, therefore, he hoped the House would forgive him if he did not plunge into the legal aspects of the case. Inasmuch, however, as the Clause now before the House resulted from the adoption of an Amendment which stood in his name, and which now seemed to be generally known by his name, he hoped he might be excused for trying to come to the rescue of his innocent offspring from the terrible doom his hon. and learned friend pronounced on it.

He should like to make one or two general remarks on questions which arose out of the controversy which ranged round the Clause. He understood and appreciated most thoroughly the attitude taken towards the Amendment by his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. Their position seemed to him to be perfectly fair and perfectly clear. Both the clergy and laity alike saw no objection whatever to the system of absolute priestly domination against which the Amendment was directed. He did not complain of the attitude of Roman Catholics in the matter; and he thought that, from their point of view, they should not accept it.

At the same time, he found some satisfaction in the undoubted fact that they would not suffer practically in the working of the Amendment, as they would be secured by the composition of the board of management; and, although he acknowledged their theoretical objection, no practical injury would accrue to them. It would, however, be absolutely impossible to allow any differential treatment for any particular section or religion; and, therefore, he could not accept the suggestion that they should differentiate between Roman Catholics and other denominations. Apart from the great Roman Catholic body, he had heard from no side any disposition to disagree with the Clause on the part of the great Nonconformist bodies; and, therefore, he was afraid he should have to treat the question as a controversy within the limits of the Anglican Church, of which he was a member. He could not say how painful to him had been some of the expressions of opinion which he had received. Old friends announced that, in consequence of his action, old friendships were at an end; and supporters of his had announced that their support would be withdrawn; but he was rather hopeful that those expressions of opinion had been somewhat premature and hurried, and that a little more consideration would show that he should not be condemned to suffer such severe penalties for taking the action he felt bound to take.

Since his Amendment was adopted, several matters had occurred to which he should like to allude. There was the great meeting at the Albert Hall, at which the Bishop of London was the chief speaker. The Bishop at that meeting announced on authority—he did not know from what source it was derived—the interpretation which had now been authoritatively given by the Attorney General. He did not, therefore, propose to quote the speech of the Bishop of London as he had intended. He was bound to accept the interpretation of the Clause given by the Attorney General, but he frankly avowed that when he moved the Amendment he did not think it contained the appeal it was now held to contain. He was, however, perfectly willing to accept that reading of the Amendment, and he believed that, as it stood, the Clause contained ample power to effect that which was its main object and purpose, viz., the complete restraint of the one-man element of control. Henceforth that element would be missing from the school, and their object would have been achieved. The Bishop of London, in a very unfortunate allusion, spoke at the Albert Hall in terms now only too well known of "Squire Western and his head farmer and gardener" having to control the religious education. He knew his "Tom Jones" as thoroughly as the Bishop of London, and he might remind his Lordship that there was also a "Parson Thwackum." If he had originally referred to the clergy as so many "Parsons Thwackum" he would rightly have been held to have spoken disrespectfully, and he protested against such a high dignitary using language equally as offensive of the squirearchy. He did not desire, however, to score a mere debating point out of that slip of the Bishop; nobody would acknowledge more readily than he the magnificent work his Lordship had done and the glorious example he was setting, but at the same time the remarks were unfortunate, not so much in themselves, as because they seemed to represent to the country a feeling of distrust in the laity. Until the mind of every Archbishop and Bishop was cleared of all distrust in the laity, the Church would not be as safe as she ought to be.

Passing from that point, he desired to suggest one or two points in support of the Clause. In Scotland there was a system of religious education under which the minister was, so to speak, the agent of a lay committee. That system worked well, and no one would contend that the average Scotch child was less well grounded than the average English child in all that pertained to the realities of religion. Most hon. Members would agree that of the religious teaching under which they were brought up only a very small element was directly derived from any minister of religion. The bulk of their religion had been taught them by their parents, notably and most impressively by their mother: it had been carried out by nurse, governess or tutor, then by the master of the private school, who was not necessarily a clergyman, and finally at the public school, so that through the whole of their career it was perfectly possible for them not to have been under the tuition of a single clergyman. Therefore, except when going through a course of preparation for confirmation, he doubted whether many Members had ever derived much religious instruction directly from any Clergyman. He made that statement simply to show that too much importance should not be attached in one case when it was not thought necessary to safeguard the instruction in another.

In order to prove that the need of this Clause had been made clearer since its adoption, he would quote another member of the Episcopal Bench. The Bishop of Liverpool had recently, in addressing his clergy, used these remarkable words—

> "There has risen out of the heart of the High Church revival a body of extreme men who have left their original leaders far behind, and who, while holding almost every Roman doctrine, contrive to satisfy their consciences that they can honestly remain in the Church of England. Of the devotion of some of these men there is no question. If self-sacrifice were the measure of truth, their orthodoxy would be unimpeachable. But the Church of England has her accredited standards of faith and practice, and has laid down well-defined limit, beyond which her members may not go; and the attitude and conduct of these extreme men are becoming an increasing source of irritation and of danger.'

The Bishop, after alluding to the various findings of Archbishop Benson, continued—

> "With these authoritative utterances before him it becomes a question how a diocesan bishop is to treat the clergy who decline to obey him."

After mentioning two or three courses, his Lordship said finally—

> "There is that policy of episcopal excommunication. He may treat the offenders as self-made Nonconformists; as having placed themselves by their own act and deed outside his jurisdiction. He may decline to be present at their services, to preach in their pulpits, to confirm in their churches, to license any assistant clergy. That is the policy I have most reluctantly adopted in this diocese, and which I intend to pursue. . . . If deprivation were substituted for imprisonment, it would be manifestly my duty to take a severer course, for the existence of this evil in our midst is a standing menace, a source of continual danger and weakness; it is alienating the laity, enraging the masses of our people; . . . and it is inflicting untold injury on morality and on religion."

Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.

These remarks from such a source tended, he thought, to prove the necessity of the Clause, and for some restriction on the clergy whom he had called eccentric and extravagant. The Clause would go far to render impossible in the schools the practices which had apparently been going on in the diocese of Liverpool. It was sometimes thought that this was a matter in which the laity were on one side and the clergy on the other. He was thankful to say that that was not in the least the case. It was true that he had had a startling correspondence, some of it in terms of extreme violence, if not indecency, but it would be most unfair that he should allow it to be supposed that all the clergy were opposed to the Clause. He had received from the clergy nearly as many letters supporting the Clause as opposing it, and he might read one as a type of many that he had received which exactly expressed his feeling—

> "After carefully considering Colonel Kenyon-Slaney's Amendment, I have come to the conclusion that many of my clerical brethren are unduly irritated and alarmed.
>
> "I do not feel at all as if I had received a slap in the face, nor do I feel at all afraid of the effect of the Amendment.
>
> "We are still protected by our trust deeds. We are protected by having four denominational managers against two outsiders, while they may very easily all be denominational, and we are safeguarded also by the fact that we do not, as a rule, draw up our own syllabus of religious instruction, but all work to a diocesan syllabus, on the lines of which our diocesan examination in religious knowledge is conducted. There is no doubt whatever that where plain simple Church instruction in the Bible, Prayer-book, and the Church Catechism is given no difficulty will arise, and no change will be made or suggested by the managers. More than this ought not to be given in public schools where Nonconformist children attend. Anyone who attempts to proselytise the children of Nonconformists attending Church schools forgets himself, both as a Christian and as a gentleman. . . ."

He quoted that letter as showing that many clergymen welcomed the Clause, and recognising that it made for good and would assist them in their work.

The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division was, he thought, a little unwise in talking as though laymen were to have no voice or right to be heard in the matter of religious teaching. Church laymen as a body would not be disposed to accept that view. They were determined that their rights in the matter should be acknowledged, and he hoped no more suggestions would be heard in the direction of dispossessing the laity of their rights—their equal rights, as he thought, with the clergy—in the matter.

His noble friend the Member for Greenwich, who often had attributed to him views more extreme than those he really held, was the accredited leader of the section of the Church of England most strongly opposed to the Clause. He therefore appealed to his noble friend to recognise the situation, to recognise how much underlay the expressions of opinion evidenced by the recent division on the Clause. Those who supported the Clause were animated by convictions as sincere, by a determination as strong, and by a loyalty to the Church as unimpeachable as those which animated the noble Lord himself. He desired him to recognise the strength of that opinion and, as a leader of thought, to realise that which he would have to oppose if he continued to resist the strong feeling to which he had referred. He did not wish his last words to be in any sense words of menace, or words on which it would be possible to place a hostile construction. On the contrary, he would rather appeal to the noble Lord to use his influence in trying to persuade some of his supporters of the unwisdom of the attitude they had assumed. No insult to the clergy was ever intended or conveyed; but it was absolutely vital, in the best interests of the clergy themselves, that there should be some opportunity of restraining the extravagance and exuberance of those few among them who abused their position, and by that abuse had shaken the confidence of the people in the Church. He asked the noble Lord to remember that that action had somewhat impaired the otherwise splendid record to which the clergy could point of services well rendered to the country; but, above all, he asked him to undertake that it should be made perfectly clear to those with whom he acted that unless the laity were not only admitted, but welcomed, to their full share in the administration of the Church to which they were entitled, it needed no prophet to say that the years of the Church as an established institution were numbered. As to the Government, he would ask them also to realise the strength of the feeling at the back of this Clause. He trusted there would be neither in the House of Commons nor in another place any dilution of the Clause, and that the Government would evidence a strong instinct of resistance to any further movement that might in any way imperil the essence of the Clause, which he believed to be absolutely vital to the good working of the Bill.

*MR. LYTTELTON (Warwick and Leamington) desired to join in the appeal to his hon. friend the Member for the Stretford Division to reconsider the position he had taken up. He held the opinion very strongly that to cut the Clause out of the Bill would be dangerous to the true interests of the Church. The agitation which had arisen in the country against the Clause was, he believed, largely due to two letters written by the Bishop of Worcester, who was naturally and rightly venerated by everyone who knew him. But it was possible to assume the entire truth of everything the Bishop had said without being in the least disturbed in one's opinion as to the desirability of this Clause. Let it be assumed, that it was a principle of an Episcopal Church that the clergy should be entitled in the pulpit to state the doctrine of that Church, and should be responsible only to their Bishop for such statement. He drew a broad distinction between the parson in the pulpit and the parson in the schools as created by this Bill. What was the present position? There were hundreds, probably thousands, of cases in which there were no trust deeds. Apart from the trust deed the parson had absolutely no greater rights in connection with a school than any parishioner, beyond that which the voluntary respect of others to his sacred office, his character, and his influence might secure him. How, then, could it be said that it was a principle of an Episcopal Church that the clergyman should have a dominant right—exclusive of all the laity in the parish—to control the religious teaching in the school? That was a proposition which could not, either historically or in good sense, be maintained. It was contrary to what all knew to be the fact, and to the established condition of things in a great number of parishes in which schools existed. Let Members test this proposition by an application to their own children. He belonged to what the Prime Minister called "the faction of parents." Would they, if they had sons seven or eight years of age, consider they were bound, out of loyalty to the Church, to submit their religious education entirely to the opinion of the clergyman of the parish? Such a proposition was absolutely unheard of, and, if put forward would be resented in the highest degree. The position of those who opposed this Clause was actually that the fathers and mothers of the children—and he attached more stress to the opinion of the mother than that of the father in this matter—through their lay representative were to have no effective voice in the control of the religious education in denominational schools. That, he contended, was not merely a novel, but an unsustainable, proposition. He would respectfully ask the clergy to consider what effect the mere assertion of such a claim was likely to produce. Such a feeling would be awakened as nobody had ever dreamt of arousing before. In thousands of parishes the clergyman would, of course, have the best knowledge of these things, and as one of the best qualities of the English people was that they were docile to those whom they believed to be better acquainted than they were with the subject in hand, a reasonable clergyman would practically never be opposed in these matters.

An objection to the prolongation of the discussion was that it was purely academic. The burdens placed on the supporters of denominational schools, after the passing of this Bill, would be very heavy, and would demand substantial sacrifices on the part of many people. How could it be believed that people would make those sacrifices for the support of a denomination, as to the principles of which the members of that denomination could not themselves agree? The position supposed an impossibility.

In conclusion, he believed that the fears entertained of opposition between the parson and the parishioners in this matter were in 999 cases out of 1,000 absolutely unfounded. He believed the local authority would be reasonable, wise, and conciliatory in the appointment of their two representatives on the board of managers, and that in the vast majority of cases they would not attempt to thrust on to the board people of militant views, opposed to those entertained by the greater number of the parishioners. He did not in the least object to a Nonconformist being made a member of the board of management of a voluntary school if he were selected with care. [Laughter.] By that he meant a man of common-sense and a conciliatory disposition, who wished to make the school as a whole work well. Many clergymen at present voluntarily associated such men with themselves in the work, and why should it be supposed that the local authority would select untractable and unreasonable men as their representatives? The Scottish Church had been referred to. In Scotland the schools worked smoothly, largely due to the lay character of the Scottish Church. The minister was associated with elders; they sat in the kirk session, the presbyteries and in the Church Assembly, and laymen had a very solid voice in the government and administration of the Scottish Church. There were many in this country—and the Bishop of Worcester was among them,—who had endeavoured to draw a lesson from the Scotch Church as to Church reform in England. The proposal now made was not an audacious step; it merely associated six men together, four of whom were to be chosen by the denomination. But no sooner was the suggestion made than an outcry had been raised. The supporters of the Clause assured the clergy that there was not the slightest idea of conveying an insult or of casting opprobrium upon them. There was only the natural and fundamental desire that the parents should have some effective voice in the teaching of their own children. He trusted that the clergy would believe that they as well as the Church of England would be fortified by the Amendment, that they would gain strength, influence, and power in the management of the schools through lay association, and he hoped that they would be induced to cordially work with laymen in an undertaking which would be beneficial to the children, honourable to the Church, and expedient in the interests of education.

(6.3.) MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent Tonbridge) said he would not say anything about the merits of this Clause, but he appealed to the Government to state most emphatically to the House precisely what the Clause meant. The difficulty they stood in was that his hon. and gallant friend told them that it had certain definite meanings. Some of them opposed the Clause on the same ground. He wished to know exactly what position they stood in. One of their principal objections to the Clause was that the appeal to the bishop was taken away, and that, so far as religious instruction went, the managers were entirely independent. As regarded secular instruction there was an appeal to the local authority and a further appeal to the Board of Education, but when they came to religious instruction the appeal to the bishop was taken away. They had been told by the Attorney General that the particular part of the trust deed which gave an appeal to the bishop on matters of doctrine was preserved. The question was, What were the doctrines taught in the schools by the clergy? On the other hand, the Committee had been told by the right hon. Member for East Fife that this particular provision was not preserved. What were laymen to conclude when two such legal authorities differed? The least that the Government could do in these circumstances was to put words in telling the committee clearly what the Clause meant. If the appeal to the Bishop was preserved, his objection to a large extent disappeared, the sting of it was removed. He also asked about the provisions as to the right of the clergyman to go into the school and teach religion. Did he understand that this provision remained in force in the case of the trust deed?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Subject to the control of the managers.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: Without the right of appeal; therefore, he could be excluded by the whim of the managers. He failed to see any reason for such a course. Practically it was an insult to the clergy, and it would lead to much friction in many parishes. Again, was there a provision in the Bill permitting diocesan inspection? He urged that these obscurities should be cleared up, and he thought that the Government would have been well advised if they had not accepted the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. That Amendment did not fall in with the general scheme of the Bill. So long as secular education was made thoroughly efficient and in all schools alike brought up to the standard of the local authority, and maintained by it, he thought the schools should have absolute freedom to teach what religion they chose. He did not think that the trust deeds should be torn up in this way by a side wind. He hoped the Government would put the matter perfectly clear, and if any part of the provisions of the trust deed was to be maintained they should know without doubt what it was. They ought to know whether the trust deeds were to be wholly or partly torn up, and if they were going to be only partly torn up they should know exactly what part would remain.

*MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said the Government when they introduced this Bill were so fair-minded that it was with great reluctance that he rose to offer a strong objection to this Clause. But he could not help feeling that this Clause raised a question of greater importance as regards the Church of England than any that had been raised for a couple of centuries, and he felt that, as regarded the Catholic Church, if they were to accept this Clause without a protest they would be really engaged in an abnegation of the faith to which they belonged. He had listened to the very temperate and calm speeches which had been delivered from the Church of England point of view, and he must say that he did not see how this Clause could be described as an insult to the Church of England or as an insult to any Church. It was not a question of an insult, it was a question of a denial of jurisdiction, and as he understood the position of the Government it was this, that they said: "Here is a Church, by law established, entitled to teach only as the law allows; and therefore, from that point of view, we have the right to decide in what manner and under what circumstances its doctrine can be taught." It was very unfortunate for Catholics that, owing to the divisions in the Church of England, there should be imposed upon them conditions not only repugnant but absolutely and diametrically inconsistent with the position which they occupied.

It was very painful to have to introduce matters of religion into debate. It was painful to have to introduce questions which men preferred to keep veiled in the recesses and tabernacle of their hearts. Yet it was necessary now to state their position on a vital issue. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife, as he understood by his references to the Bishop of Worcester's speech, had put his finger upon the sore spot in the heartsof the English Protestant clergy, because this Clause, for the first time in hundreds of years, dug up again all the questions that were raised at the time of the Reformation really. It raised the question whether the Protestant Church of England was a teaching Church or whether it was not. Taking into account the innumerable difficulties with which he was surrounded, and the temper with which he was treated, he could well understand the First Lord of the Treasury finding refuge in a Clause of this kind. But how had it been received by the Opposition? Why, he thought that if the right hon. Gentleman had proposed no other Amendment, this Clause should have enabled the Opposition to accept this Bill, because, from a Protestant point of view, it reduced the position of the Church of England to the position of the Presbyterian Church or the Nonconformist Churches in England, because the Anglican clergy, as he understood it, claimed to be a portion of the teaching Church, and this Amendment associated with them for the purposes of controlling religious teaching, to use a common expression, "the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker." Were he disposed to find a subject for merriment, as a Catholic, in the position to which this reduced the Church of England, he should certainly find it in this lay control. However, he refrained from taking any line of that kind, because this was a matter which was painful to him and searched the heart. Therefore, instead of using taunts against Protestantism he would confine himself simply to the position which they took up as Catholics.

This Bill had gradually, from their point of view, placed Catholics at a disadvantage. It placed religious teaching and the school books under the control of the local authority; it placed the repairs of the buildings upon the voluntary schools, and finally this present proposal seemed to him to go very far indeed to make this Bill a sort of Greek gift to the voluntary schools. He could not complain if the action of the Government did not affect Catholic schools, because, from a Protestant point of view, this being a State Church, Parliament was entitled to define the tenets of the State religion. But take the Catholic position. Either their Church was a pestilential superstition, or else it was a divinely-appointed Church, and their answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, when he taunted them with the remarks of the Bishop of Worcester as to the individual cleric not being the repository of dogma was this: it was an answer given of old. It was—

> "He that will not hear the Church let him be to thee as the heathen and a publican."

That was the Catholic answer, and he was sorry to have to utter it in this assembly. You say to the Protestant minister, "You are not to have the right, because you are not the Church, to say what Protestantism is." Take the military position. The man the soldier had first to obey was the corporal, the corporal had to obey the sergeant, and so on up to the general. And that was the point of view from which Catholics had to look at this matter. He regretted to have to raise dogmatic matters in this Assembly, and he did it in order to explain their position, and he had to do so. With them the individual clergyman, however humble, was the repository of their faith, and he was entitled to teach it. If they disliked his doctrine they appealed from him to the Bishop, and if they disliked the Bishop's doctrine then we say "Go to Rome." But what was their plight under this Clause? It was that the control of religious education was put under a board of managers most of whom must be laymen and some of whom must be Protestants. And remember this—he hardly thought the

First Lord of the Treasury could have remembered it, or else he was sure that with his liberal and tolerant mind he would have made some provision against it—remember that, in the case of Catholics and the Catholic schools, they were nearly all in towns. The Church of England schools were very largely in country districts, consequently the county authority was far away; it was a loose body; but the Town Council which had to preside over Catholic schools was on the spot; it might be a Kensitised town council, and it might be, as in Lancashire, where many Catholics had found a home, that that special form of militant Protestantism was to be found there. Therefore these Catholic schools would be carrying on their operations under the town councils which were almost within immediate view of these schools, and to some of whom the idea of Catholicism was that of a gross and repugnant superstition.

Was it, therefore, to be wondered at that even in this tolerant country the Catholic clergy should have taken alarm and should have objected so strongly as they did to this Clause? He did hope that as time passed by the town councils of England would be imbued with that religious toleration of which they had had so many excellent examples in this great Assembly. They must remember, however, that in essence they were Protestants, and that many of them entertained the very strongest and most militant Protestant views. They must remember the fact that many of these institutions were conventual institutions conducted by nuns. Therefore he could well understand the alarm and anxiety which was generated in the minds of the managers of voluntary schools from the fear—he trusted it might be an illusion—that the power which this Bill undoubtedly gave such town councils as those to which he had referred in those neighbourhoods might be used to interfere with the managers of these voluntary schools. He understood fully the enormous difficulties which the Government had in passing a measure of this kind, which was intended to give satisfaction to those who were conducting the voluntary education of this country.

He did not intend to say more beyond this. The construction of this Clause as a legal matter had been debated tonight by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife and the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for England. He must say that he was rather disposed to agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, because he thought "tenour" was a less coercive word, and it was a word of less magnitude than the word "control," which made the managerial power something more absolute. He was wondering whether the Government would accept, as a slight solatium, after the word "shall" the words "subject as aforesaid." That was what he should suggest might be inserted in line 9. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had contended tonight that the words "tenour of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed" were really the governing words, but as they were followed by the words "shall be under the control of the managers," he suggested that after the word "shall" some slight alteration should be made by the insertion of the words "and shall subject as aforesaid,"—that was, subject to the tenour aforesaid—be under the control of the managers. He did not say that the acceptance of that Amendment would carry them a very long way, but at any rate it would be some slight protection to the interests of the managers in those voluntary schools, whether Protestant or Catholic. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved this Amendment, and whose name was associated with it, had admitted, had felt compelled to admit to the full the fact that this Clause was unjust to the Catholics. He thought they were entitled, from the attitude the Government had assumed throughout the progress of this Bill, to ask that either here or elsewhere they would introduce some provision which would have some mollifying effect upon the apprehensions which, undoubtedly, at the present time had been raised, and strongly raised in the minds of Catholics.

(6.25.) MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he did not think that there was any fear that this Clause would in any respect whatever interfere with the religious teaching given in Roman Catholic schools. They did not wish to interfere in any degree with the religious teaching given by the Catholics. He thought it was most satisfactory that the Government had announced their determination of not receding from the position they had taken up of maintaining the Kenyon-Slaney Clause in its entirety. The hon. and learned Member had pronounced a glowing eulogy upon the clergy, but that appeared to him to be unnecessary, because in all parts of the House they were prepared to acknowledge their confidence and veneration for the work which the clergy of all denominations had performed. The hon. and learned Member who proposed this Amendment appeared to glide very gently over the fact that there was at the present time a hostile movement in the Church of England. He did not want to refer to that movement, for he was anxious not to wound the susceptibilities of any hon. Member of the House, but they all knew what were the doctrines taught by many of the clergymen. He did not think that this Clause would interfere in the slightest degree with the High Church, the Low Church, or the Broad Church parties, or with Nonconformist ministers or Roman Catholic priests, so long as they kept within the laws of their Church.

They had had two views put before them as to the meaning of the Clause from high legal authorities on both sides of the House, and it would ill become him to express any opinion on the subject. Certainly he might say, as an uninstructed layman, he thought that the word "tenour" meant "general purpose or tendency" and his impression—it might be entirely wrong—was that so long as the general religious teaching of the school was adhered to, the manner in which that teaching was given could be left to the discretion of the managers. But they had it on high authority that the word "tenor" included matters of doctrine, and that there was provision in the trust deeds for appeal to the bishop, and that that appeal was not interfered with by the Bill. He could only say that if that was so he was sorry to hear it, because he thought they ought to place reliance upon the managers, of whom the clergyman would be one, probably the chairman, to deal with these matters as they arose. He believed difficulties which might arise would be settled much better by an appeal to the law courts than by a reference to the bishops. They all respected the bishops, but they knew they had failed altogether to deal with the lawlessness in the Church, and if they had failed to do that how could they expect them to deal with lawlessness in the schools? The bishops ought to be relieved of that onus, and from inquiry into those small domestic quarrels. He did not believe these quarrels would arise. Whenever the clergyman was a law-abiding clergyman, whether of the Church of England or a minister of any other denomination, he would find no difficulty whatever in working with his managers. They had been told again and again that the object of the Clause was to put an end to one-man management, and to make the managers as a body supreme for all purposes. If that was not to be so, if the religious teaching was to be taken from the managers and left in the hands of clergymen subject to an appeal to the bishop, the clergyman would snap his fingers at the managers; if any question arose as to religious teaching in the schools he could say: "This is beyond your province, this is a matter entirely within my province, and you have nothing to do with it." He therefore ventured very humbly and earnestly to express the hope that no proposal would be entertained to modify the Clause. Let them keep the Clause as it stood. He was sure the fact that that Clause had been accepted by the Government was reassuring to great numbers of people in the country, people who were beginning to doubt as to whether the Government and the House were really faithful to the Protestant cause of the National Church of this country. By inserting this Clause in the Bill they had reassured them that something had been done at last to check extreme men and protect the young people of our schools, and he ventured to hope the House would in an unmistakable manner adhere to the position at which it had already arrived.

Lord HUGH CECIL said he greatly regretted it had been thought necessary to raise this controversy at all, and that is was not found possible to leave the matter as it stood originally in the Bill. In that event a great deal of bitterness would have been avoided; the disappointment which now prevailed among supporters of the Bill would not have been aroused; the Bill would have passed through the House more easily, and when it came into operation would have been found to work more smoothly. But—with excellent intentions, as he believed—the Government and the hon. Member for the Newton Division had started upon a very difficult task, and, the blind leading the blind, both had fallen into one of the deepest theological ditches. They had raised a controversy which went to the very root of the existence of the Church, which introduced all kinds of side issues in connection with education, which it was impossible or undesirable to discuss in all their bearings in that House, but the full meaning of which was disclosed in the striking passage at the end of the speech of the hon. Member for the Newton Division when he appealed to him to use his influence to prevent any sharp difference between the clergy and the laity which might end in disestablishment. He could not congratulate the hon. Member on having taken a course which, in his own opinion, had brought disestablishment within the vista of practical politics. It was, indeed, a most unfortunate controversy, which, however it might be settled, could not but do a great deal of harm.

Perhaps one of the most embarrassing points of the controversy was that the position of those who objected to the Kenyon-Slaney Clause was, even by some of the best friends of the Church, like the hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington, profoundly misunderstood. It was not a question of giving the laity of the Church a proper voice in the management of the Church. It was not a question, in his view, of what might be called Church reform. If it were surely they should not have seen the Bishop of Worcester, a prominent advocate of the increase of the power of the laity in the Church, among the most pronounced opponents of the Clause. But the confusion of mind which those who objected to the Clause had to deal with was best illustrated in the speech of the Attorney General, who made a curious distinction, quite unparalleled in theological controversy, between doctrine and machinery. According to the hon. and learned Gentleman, the difference between Anglicans and Presbyterians, between the Roman Catholic Church and the Society of Friends, was only an affair of machinery; that all the great questions about which Christians had been divided for 300 years were mere matters of machinery. Of all the hazy views to which theological discussion gave rise that was the haziest. What the opponents of the Clause complained of was, not that the Clause gave the laity certain rights of appeal to the bishop to bring the clergy to book when they transgressed the laws of the Church, but that it superseded the clergyman altogether in questions relating to religious instruction to be given in the schools, and substituted in his place a small committee of laymen. Of course, a clergyman would be on the committee, but the majority of laymen would prevail. In some of the Synods in the Colonies the clergy and the laity sat together, but no proposal could be carried unless both orders assented. If they put clergy and laity on the committee and allowed most votes to carry the day, they were not having co operation between the clergy and laity, but they were superseding the clergy altogether. That went very deeply to the foundation of the position of the Church of England. The Church of England maintained, and had always maintained, that the ordained ministers were the only persons entitled to teach its doctrines and to speak in behalf of the Church. Of course, the laity were perfectly free to give their opinions to make speeches as free citizens, and discuss religious questions with the greatest freedom. But the laity were not entitled to teach doctrines on behalf of the Church of England, or of the universal Church. That was a proposition which seemed to be understood.

The hon. Member for the Newton Division had found fault with the Ritualists. But the hon. Gentleman was in the same boat with them. If he might apply to the hon. Gentleman without offence the kind of language which was sometimes used in reference to the Ritualists, he would say that his hon. friend was a violator of, and disloyal to the settlement of the Church of England, for that settlement was not less identified with the proposition that the doctrines of the Church could only be taught by its ordained ministers than it was with the Protestant constitution of the Church, to which his hon. friend had referred. He had also noticed, in the speeches of his hon. friend the Member for Warwick and

Leamington and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife, a reference to these schools as State schools. They were State schools for secular purposes, supported by the State, but was it to be understood that for the purposes of religious instruction these schools were to be regarded as the State schools? If that were so, it was heard of now for the first time. The understanding was that they were to be the State schools—schools supported by the State and under the control of the State—for the purposes of secular education, but that their religious character was to remain undisturbed, that they were to continue to be denominational schools, and that, being denominational schools, those which were attached to the Church of England should continue to teach Church of England doctrines. If these schools were to be Church schools, and were to give teaching acceptable to the Church, then the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was utterly indefensible. They might as well propose to allow a committee of laymen to dictate to the clergyman what his sermons were to be on Sundays. It was exactly the same thing. If his hon. and gallant friend would read the canons of the Church of England of 1604, which were legally binding on every clergyman in the country, he would find that schoolmasters were to be licensed by the Ordinary, and that no schoolmaster was to teach unless so licensed. That was the old idea, and although they had departed from it, they had done so in order to substitute for that idea such machinery as was set up in the trust deeds. The rights of the ecclesiastics were not put into those deeds inadvertently, but deliberately, for the very purpose of maintaining that Church system of teaching which his hon. and gallant friend sought to destroy. It seemed to him very strange that when they were professing to keep up Church schools carried on on Church principles, they should violate the trust deeds and at the same time violate one of the fundamental principles of the Church which all were brought up to accept.

As to the extreme clergy of whom complaint was made, he was as much in favour as was his hon. and gallant friend of setting up a system of discipline which would restore order in the Church of England, but he was quite sure it could not be done on the lines his hon. and gallant friend advocated. There was only one hope for discipline in the Church of England, and that was in the authority of the Bishops. He was quite certain that the present anarchy and difficulty in the Church of England would go on, and would be found irremediable, unless they were prepared to put much greater powers in the hands of the Bishops than they possessed at present. He believed the proper way of dealing with the difficulty would be to give the Bishop the power of excluding clergymen where he thought they were in the wrong, as he had suggested in a Clause which, however, he had had no chance of proposing. The visitatorial Clause set out the machinery which would have stopped extreme practices against the principles of the Church of England; but his hon. and gallant friend's machinery would not put an end to these practices at all. There were already several strong ritualist squires, and probably in the future there would be more; and was it to be supposed that the ritualist squire, together with the ritualist parson, would not prevail on the board of management, and have matters entirely their own way? If they were to deal with these extreme practices they would have to create some visitatorial authority.

He would now pass to the other point he desired to make—the principle of the trust deeds. The foundation of the Bill, they had understood, was that the rights in the trust deeds were to be respected. The rights to the buildings were to be respected because they were rights of property, and those who erected the building and kept it up were to be allowed special rights with regard to the building. But among the rights of the trust deeds were the rights of the clergyman; what title had they to set aside one out of a bundle of rights, so to speak? He understood much better the point of view of the Opposition, who wished to put these schools under popular control. He appealed strongly to his hon. and gallant friend not to suppose that the violation of trust deeds was a light matter. A precedent was being set which would be used against them in future. A great many persons and institutions owned property under trust; he was not at all clear that all the endowments of the Church of England might not be treated as property under trust. If they were to violate trust deeds in this instance, why not in other instances? Hon Members opposite were only too apt pupils in the art of predatory legislation; they had sat at the feet of his hon. and gallant friend, learning with quick attention the lesson he had taught them, and presently, no doubt, they would begin to lecture on their own account, and to set out new proposals, in which the value of trust deeds might be destroyed altogether. From these two points of view the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was most ill-omened. That the reference to the Bishop destroyed the lay control altogether seemed to him a very extravagant proposition. The reference to the Bishop was a reference to an authorised expert in theology, who was to tell the teachers what was and what was not the teaching of the Church, which they were bound to give under the trust deed, as it were. He believed that in cases where the Bishop decided against the clergyman that would restrain him, because the other managers could turn the clergyman out without more ado, and that would be the proper method to adopt. But it was an extremely clumsy and ineffective method.

His feeling of alarm at the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend was partly on account of its practical effects. In many cases there would be Nonconformist representatives, who, as was said the other day by an hon. Member opposite, were only too likely, in some districts at any rate, to use this power as a weapon to break up the dual system to which hon. Members opposite objected. The representative put upon the board of managers by Nonconformists would keep it an open sore. There would be nothing more easy than for an intelligent Nonconformist who wished to do so to make the life of the clergyman or of the Church manager a burden by constantly raising questions as to what was or was not Church teaching, and under that pressure the teaching might be modified to suit the ideas of the Nonconformist minority, and be so worn-down, that in the end what was in truth a Church school would become just as undenominational as a board school. He did not think his hon. and gallant friend desired that there should be no distinction between church and undenominational schools, but with a Nonconformist minority constantly objecting and criticising in this way it was only too likely to result. He felt another objection still more deeply; apart altogether from the practical effect, he did not believe that the settlement which his hon. and gallant friend was so painstakingly trying to make would be at all a lasting one. Therefore, so far as the schools went, whatever mischief would be done would probably be done only for a few years; but he did deprecate in the strongest way the tendency, which he had feared, and which had shown itself that night, to import this principle out of the management of a school into Church matters. It was no exaggeration to say that if the principle of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment were applied to the Church of England itself, that Church would be broken in twain instantly, and the more vital and living part of the Church would secede if Parliament insisted on such a principle. This matter went to the very root of the principles of the Church, and, doubtless his hon. and gallant friend would be found a truer prophet than he thought when he said that the disturbance arising out of such a struggle would lead all too quickly to disestablishment itself.

(6.56.) COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said he would only occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes, but he thought he need make no excuse for saying a word or two on a matter which deeply interested his co-religionists in Ireland. The House had listened with great attention, as it always did, to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for North Louth, who had voiced his case and the case of his co-religionists so temperately, and, if he would allow him to add, so eloquently before the House. Of course he understood, and they all understood, that the idea of laymen entering into matters connected with the Church at all was quite contrary to the religion of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and that no Roman Catholic layman would attempt to interfere with the religious teaching in his schools. This Clause would only interfere with the Roman Catholics in this country. He was not a member of the Church of

England, he was a member of a Church which was at one time connected with the Church of England—he meant the Church of Ireland—in which laymen and clergy collaborated together without any ill effects. He spoke also in the name of Irish Protestants on this matter, and "Protestant" was a word which he had not heard often enough in this debate to please him. If an intelligent pagan had been sitting up in the gallery and had listened to the course of the debate, he would have been led to believe that there were a vast number of different religions represented in the House. He should say, at the outside, there were only three different religions represented there. There were first of all, in overwhelming majority, Protestants, then Roman Catholics, and then there were Jews. There were certainly, he believed, some Unitarians, but he did not know what religion they belonged to. But the intelligent pagan in the gallery would make a great mistake if he imagined that the gentlemen who spoke as Presbyterians, as Methodists, as Churchmen, or as Quakers, belonged to different religions. One word covered them all, and that was the word "Protestant." Therefore, whatever affected, in their estimation, the welfare of the Protestant religion was of deep interest to the Protestant Irishmen.

He had approved very much of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, until he heard it explained by the Attorney General. After having sat in the House for many years he could say he had always been thrown into a state of mental confusion on hearing two distinguished lawyers speaking on the same subject against each other. They had heard two such men of great legal ability speaking tonight, the one holding views diametrically opposed to those of the other. Which was right? Possibly neither. He should hope that before the debate closed the Prime Minister would state clearly to the House what the view of the Government was with regard to the meaning of the Clause. According to the Attorney General it did not mean anything at all. As far as he could make out, in a great number of schools the managers would be a body without any power at all. Now, what the Protestants wanted (he did not know about the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich) was to give the managing bodies of the schools direct power over the religious instruction in those schools. Why? It was no use mincing matters. Anyone who had considered the present position of the Church of England must come to the conclusion that the teaching of some of the clergy was diametrically opposed to Protestantism and to the principles of the Reformation. He believed that his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects had just as much right to have their religion respected as he had himself, but he had no respect at all for the man who took Protestant pay and taught Roman Catholic doctrine, and he believed the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich made a great mistake if he thought that Protestant feeling had died away in the country. He had believed (until the Attorney General spoke) that the object of this Amendment was to effect what Protestants believed ought to be carried out, viz., to give the laity of the Church the power to prevent the inculcation of doctrines which, as Protestants of all ranks, they could not accept. It was because they thought and believed that the Amendment gave that power and authority that they cordially supported it. A question arose in his mind (after the Attorney General's speech) whether it did so. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife appeared to think that it did, but the Attorney General thought it did not. He hoped the Prime Minister would get up and tell them what the Clause really did do. What the great majority of the House meant it to do was to give the managing bodies of the schools power over the religious instruction in those schools. To hear the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich speak, one would think that these schools were entirely full of Church children. He ought not to forget that there were included children of all denominations. It had been argued that it was was only the priest of the Church who had any right whatever to teach with authority the Christian truth. That was the doctrine of the hon. Member for Fife and the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. That might be the doctrine of Anglicans—a word he hated—it used to be Church of England—Anglican was a new word brought in of late years; but it was that Anglican movement which to his mind had rendered this Clause an absolute necessity, unless they wanted the Protestantism (a word he was not ashamed of) of their children and those who came after to be upset by dishonest priests who wished to destroy the Protestantism which had been, to his mind, and to the minds, he believed, of the vast majority of the British people, the foundation of all their greatness and their freedom.

MR. WANKLYN (Bradford, Central) said he desired to explain why he was opposed to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment and meant to vote against it. It seemed to him to be quite clear that unless the bishops would exercise their authority no body of managers could check extravagances, while if the bishops did exercise their authority the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was unnecessary. But, while that Amendment was practically useless, it seemed to him to be positively mischievous, for it operated against a good understanding between men of different denominations. In his own constituency sectarian strife had largely died out. Every day a better understanding was being arrived at. The clergymen of the Church of England and the priests of the Roman Catholic Church had invited the City Council of Bradford to appoint Nonconformists to sit on their boards of managers after this Bill became law. That was a very remarkable fact. It showed a good feeling between men of all denominations—a feeling which all men on both sides must hope to arrive at and do their best to approach. A formal invitation to this effect was sent to the Bradford City Council by Father Gosse, of St. Patrick's School, Bradford, and in the course of his letter the rev. gentleman said—

> "I do not anticipate that there will be the slightest friction or want of harmony in the relations of the managers with the city representatives, but that all will work as one man for the benefit of our schools. In fact, I think I can say we would much prefer that the public representatives associated with us should not be our co-religionists. Such an arrangement might easily give ground for suspicion on a matter that ought to be conducted openly and above board. It is our wish that the affairs of our schools should be so conducted above board and without suspicion."

That letter seemed to him to contain a most satisfactory statement that must rejoice the hearts of all who desired to see sectarian strife ended. But under the Kenyon-Slaney Clause was it conceivable that Father Gosse would invite the City Council of Bradford to send two Nonconformists who would control the religious education of his school? He held no brief for Father Gosse—he had not the honour of knowing him—but it seemed impossible if this Clause became law that Father Gosse could invite men of another denomination to assist him in the control of his schools. He hoped a *modus vivendi* might yet be arrived at which would enable the bringing together of members of different denominations in the management of these schools—which would permit a Wesleyan sitting on the board of a Church of England school, a member of the Church of England on the board of a Roman Catholic school, and of a Roman Catholic sitting on the board of either. So far as the Roman Catholic schools were concerned, the Kenyon-Slaney Clause was distinctly unfair. The use of these schools for three nights a week as well as in the daytime was given to the State for the purpose of secular education, and the consideration was that those at the head of the denomination should be free to control the religious instruction to be given in the school. How could it be said that the priest was free and unfettered if he had associated with him five or six lay managers who under the Bill would have equal control over the instruction? It was, to his mind, clear that the Kenyon-Slaney Clause was a distinct departure from the understanding arrived at with regard to the voluntary schools. The free use of the schools was to be given in return for the unfettered right to teach the faith of the denomination. On that ground, but primarily because he felt that the Clause would in its working prevent the association on boards of management of men of different denominations, but would on the other hand lead to strife, he would vote for its deletion from the Bill.

SIR RICHARD JEBB (Cambridge University) suggested that in line 9, after the word "shall," the words "subject as aforesaid "should be inserted; that would mean subject to the tenour and conditions of the trust deed. Or a better form of the same suggestion would be to insert after "and" in line 9 the words "subject thereto."

Mr. T. M. HEALY pointed out that the word "thereto" already occurred in the same line with an entirely different meaning, so that if the hon. Member's suggestion were acted upon there would be two "thereto's" in the same line meaning two entirely different things.

Sir RICHARD JEBB saw the purport of the objection. The point of his suggestion was to get rid of the words "the tenour of." He had never yet been able to learn what the word "tenour" in this Clause meant. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife had suggested that it meant the general scope, so that if the teaching were in accordance with the general scope of the provisions of the trust deed it might be permitted to be out of accord with the details. In that case the objections of many of his friends to the Clause would be increased. If, however, the word "tenour" were omitted, and some such words as had been suggested by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth inserted, many who did not like the sub-Section as it stood would be more inclined to support it.

Major JAMESON (Clare, W.) desired to express his great hostility to the Clause. The subject had been treated from many points of view, but there had been no speech which he regretted more than that of the right hon. and gallant Genlteman the Member for North Armagh, who had practically declared that the universal religion was that of Protestantism. Was he afraid of the meaning of "universal?" Was he afraid of the word "catholic?" "Catholic" meant the universal religion of the Church of England. Why should they object to the ministers appointed by the Church teaching the doctrines of that Church to the children? He deeply resented the idea that a committee of irresponsible laymen should have the control of this matter. It was a question not of distrust of the laity, but of distrust of the clergy, and of the doctrines they taught. It was true the Church of Ireland had been disestablished, but if it produced the rancour between Roman Catholics and Protestants which he had seen in Ireland he was sufficiently imbued with the rights of the Church to say he was very glad that that Church had gone. The clergy, and the clergy alone, whether Roman Catholics or Church of England, had the right to teach the dogmas of their Church to the young. The command to "go forth and preach" had never been taken back, and the day the Church refused to have her theology taught to the children, that day would her fate be sealed, and disestablishment would quickly follow. He should certainly endeavour by every means in his power to destroy the Clause.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [this day] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was, in page 5, line 6, to leave out sub-section (4) of Clause 7.—(*Mr. Cripps.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'religious instruction' stand part of the Bill."

(9.0.) Mr. MILVAIN (Hampstead) said he did not think the existing law was interfered with in any way whatever. The existing state of things was that denominational schools were, generally speaking, founded upon trust deeds, which usually placed the direction or supervision of religious education in the hands of the incumbent, subject to an appeal to the bishop. By common consent religious education was left in the hands of the incumbent. That was common ground, and the appeal to the Bishop implied that a decision must have been arrived at previously by one of the parties to the appeal, and there could be no appeal unless there had been interference with the incumbent from laymen or managers. The Kenyon-Slaney Amendment laid down that there should be religious education in accordance with the tenour of the trust, and that it should be subject to the control of the managers.

So long as the majority on the board of management did their duty and assisted the clergyman in the direction of religious education, he saw no ground for fearing either the disestablishment of the Church or the difficulties which had been spoken of by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. As the existing law was not interfered with, he would, if the supporters of the Government were to vote as they pleased, vote for the deletion of the Clause; but if the matter were made one of confidence, he would be prepared to support the Clause. He wished to know what the intention of the Government was.

*MR. GUTHRIE (Tower Hamlets, Bow) thought the question was one on which Members ought to be at liberty to take their own line. He would be compelled to vote against the Clause, guided by a principle which was one of the foundations of belief of the Conservative Party, namely, the sanctity of property. The question of the rights of property seemed to have been too much neglected. To alter the trust deeds would be a serious breach of trust, and he regretted that the Government should have been the initiators of such a proposal. He agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich that it was unfortunate that the Government should have given such a bad example to the Party opposite, whose instincts towards predatory legislation were quite keen enough.

*MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) desired to associate himself with those who had spoken against the Clause. He thought the Government were making a grave mistake in violating the sanctity of trust deeds. It was not only a question of the rights of property, but it was an operation which would greatly interfere with voluntary effort in the future. In days to come, hospitals, infirmaries, and similar institutions, which held their moneys under trust deeds might be taken over by Governments and their trust deeds might be altered in accordance with the particular views obtaining at the moment, and in opposition to the desires of the benefactor. Under such circumstances it was not at all likely that people would be inclined to make such deeds of gift in the future, and voluntary effort would thus be in peril of extinction. A few days previously the House had been asked to consider the feelings of the teachers if they were not allowed to take part in the religious instruction. But what about the feelings of the clergy under this arrangement? They would be infinitely more deeply wounded than those of the teachers; and the feelings of the children, which had not been much considered in the matter, would be of great perplexity when they found that the gentleman to whom they looked on Sundays for their religious teaching was debarred by the action of a fortuitous concourse of managers from giving that instruction on weekdays. He asked whether the words "the tenour of" were not very peculiar words to insert in a legal document? He had never seen the phrase so used before, and would like to know whether it was one well recognised in courts of law, or one that had been invented for the purposes of this Bill If it had been invented for the purpose of dealing with, and was to be confined to, the endowments of voluntary schools, he thought the action of the Government was going very far, and that in the future they would have cause to regret that they, as a Conservative Government had ever laid a finger on trust deeds which hitherto had always been respected.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth) thought the practical effect of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment would not be great; but its possible effect, regarding it in its technical sense, was not satisfactory. He did not think that religious education, under the existing system of the Church of England, produced the alarming consequences in the working of schools which had been depicted. The one instance of abuse which, after years of search, had been brought to the notice of the House, was said to have occurred in the school of St. John's, Sutton-on-Plym, in his own constituency, and from his own knowledge he was satisfied that the hon. Member who brought that matter forward had alighted on a mare's nest. But the House was not legislating entirely in regard to probable consequences, and it ought not to leave an uncertainty in the Bill in reliance on the common sense which marked the working of English institutions. The House ought to provide safeguards which would be satisfactory to those concerned in religious education. He believed the Bill would secure the appointment of Christian teachers in voluntary schools, which would be of great advantage, but the subscribers to and the trustees of Church schools were entitled to something more than was provided in this Clause. The Clause purported to put the control of religious education in the hands of a body of managers who might be laymen, whereas the trust deeds of Church schools put the direction of religious education in the hands of the clergyman of the parish. The Attorney General had assured the House that the safeguards of the present system would still exist. If that was the case, and the intention of the Clause was to leave the direction of religious instruction in the hands where the trust deeds now reposed it, he could not see why it should have been moved. But what difficulty was there in embodying in the Clause words which would make its intention perfectly clear? Trustees of a school which was supposed to be maintained on Church of England principles, and in accordance with the terms of the trust deed, might have conscientious scruples against handing that school over to the control of a system set up by an Act of Parliament, the main Clause of which, in regard to religious education, was, on the face of it, absolutely contrary to the terms of the trust deed. In the West of England there was great anxiety among trustees as to whether the Clause would enable them to discharge the obligations which they, as conscientious men, felt they had undertaken, if they handed over the school or proceeded with it under the terms of the Bill. The Attorney General said the intention was embodied by implication that the appeal to the Bishops in matters of doctrine would be retained. And yet the Government would not risk putting it in plain words. That was a form of high obstinacy which he did not understand in matters of business. There were difficulties enough in the Bill, without complicating it unnecessarily.

The course the Government were adopting was not that that might have been expected from a Government with an absolutely loyal majority behind them, or from a Government dealing with vital matters upon which many Members had been ready to risk the possibility of their continuance in public life. He hoped that a higher courage would take possession of the Government, and that they would not let a nervous apprehension as to the views of this or that

Party affect their conduct. Let them make the intention of the Clause clear, so that the trustees of Church schools might know that what was to be taught in Church schools was the doctrine of the Church of England ascertained by the Bishops of that Church, and not the doctrine of the Church of England according to the views of any casual body of laymen who might be collected from time to time. No other religious body, whether of Nonconformists or of Roman Catholics, would consent to have such matters so dealt with, and why in the single case of the Church of England was it to be said that these decisions should be given, not by the authority which could deal with the matters with the responsibility and the sense of duty arising out of long ages of usage, but by a tribunal consisting of a casually collected body of persons? There was a feeling in the country on this subject which he thought ought to be satisfied. For the sake of some technical punctilio as to the phrasing of the Amendment, or from some ungrounded apprehension of the loyalty of the Conservative Party or the common sense of the constituencies, the Government were running the risk of wrecking the future operation of their Bill in Church of England schools by refusing to insert in plain words in this Clause that which they confessedly believed to be implied.

(9.34.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It has been said by the hon and learned Member for North Louth, and also by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, that this raises a very deep question, and that is perfectly true. It raises the question of the relation between the nation, who are the laity, and the clergy in respect of the religious education of the children. A greater question than that cannot be raised. The hon. and learned Member for North Louth, speaking on behalf of the great communion to which he belongs, very fairly and clearly stated what their view is, that all questions of religion belong exclusively to the clergy, with an appeal to the Bishop of the Diocese, and ultimately to the Bishop of Rome. That is an ecclesiastical constitution which is perfectly intelligible. But, as I understand it, the view of the noble Lord the

Member for Greenwich is precisely the same, only he does not go further than the Bishop of the Diocese. It is that all religious teaching belongs exclusively to the clergy.

LORD HUGH CECIL: That all religious teaching given in the name and on behalf of the Church of England must be given by the ordained ministry.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes; but I should like to know what the authority for that proposition is. If true, it is wonderfully little observed, because part of the teaching is given by people who are not ordained—by lay teachers, who are to be appointed under this Bill, not by the clergy or by the bishop, but by the managers; they are to be laymen appointed by laymen to give religious teaching in the denominational schools. I think that disposes of the ecclesiastical theory and the fundamental principle expounded by the noble Lord. I do not enter into the ecclesiastical controversy on that subject, I only deal with the practice which exists. I think the noble Lord said something about the canons of 1603. That is a long time ago, and in the 20th century the practice of the Church is not in accordance with the canons of 1603. So much for that. The real difference between the ecclesiastical system of the Church of England and that of the Church of Rome is that the Church of England was lay-established, it was enacted by the laity. I do not know whether the noble Lord is familiar with the preamble of the Act of Uniformity; that is the Act on which the Prayer-book depends.

LORD HUGH CECIL: The right hon. Gentleman is quite wrong in saying that the Prayer-book depends on it; the Prayer-book depends on the Act of Charles II. as far as it depends on anything.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: There was an amendment in the reign of Charles II., but the Prayer-book was established by the Act of Elizabeth.

LORD HUGH CECIL. No.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I will not go into that any further with the noble Lord, except to say that the Prayer-book of the Church of England was established by the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth, and in that Act the Lords Spiritual took no part; all the Bishops and Convocation voted against it. There is another difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; the appointment of Bishops is by the Crown, and whereas the ultimate appeal on matters of doctrine in the Church of Rome is to the Pope, in the Church of England it is to a lay tribunal, the Privy Council. I only mention those notorious facts as being a perfect refutation of the clerical theory of the noble Lord. Popular control is a thing not unknown to the Church of England, and it properly finds its place in this Bill. If you may have a lay schoolmaster appointed by lay managers to teach the doctrines of the Church of England, then you have a recognition of the right of laymen in the teaching of religion.

I will not go any further into ecclesiastical theories. What I have risen specially for is, to ask what is the present position of His Majesty's Government in regard to this question. My hon. and gallant friend has shown the courage that belongs to his profession in bringing forward this question. He has told us of "the perils of the field" he has undergone. Sydney Smith once said that the greatest punishment that could be inflicted upon anybody is to be preached to death by wild curates, and that is what my hon. and gallant friend has experienced. He will go down to posterity, no doubt, with the crown of martyrdom; but I am very glad to think that, though we live in days of the wearing of various uniforms, we do not live in a time in which he would have appeared in an *auto-da-fe*, and, in a San Benito uniform, have been consigned to the flames; that we are not back in the days when clerical domination flourished in a form in which the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich would desire to see it.

What, Sir, is the history of this Amendment? It was brought forward by the hon. and gallant Member, but

I think he is too prudent a man to have brought it forward without some idea of how it would be entertained. I did not think that the moment he sat down after moving an Amendment of this kind, the Secretary of the Education Department would have risen and embraced it at once, and that it would have received the confirmation of the First Lord of the Treasury. I suppose they knew then what it meant. I do not know whether they had a legal opinion on the subject. I should very much like to know whether this legal astute opinion of the Attorney General's was given before the Government assented to and accepted the Amendment in the House itself, or whether it was born immediately before the Albert Hall meeting. I should very much like to know what was the genesis of this remarkable theory of the difference between "tenour of doctrine" and "machinery of control." I do not think that even the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages could have devised a more elaborate and unsustainable theory. The hon. and gallant Member, not only with courage, but with frankness, told the House what his intention was. The object of his Motion was to give an authority which should restrain the clergy from irregular practices. There is no mention of the bishops at all. It is an extraordinary thing, that in an ecclesiastical discussion of this kind, I have not been able to find in the language of the Government at all, their recognition of the existence of such a person as a Bishop. The Secretary to the Board of Education at once followed and accepted the Amendment as expressing the views the Government had always entertained. And, speaking of the operation of the Amendment, what it was intended to do and what it might do in rare cases when it was required, he said—

> "The clergyman, if he were a man of ordinary tact and good humour, would not find his special province invaded by the managers who worked on the board with him. There might be cases, no doubt, when a clergyman would find a restraint put upon his action if he insisted on observances which were not in accordance with the general desire of the community."

That was the first acceptance of this Amendment. It was opposed by the noble Lord the Member for Chichester and the hon. Member for Tonbridge, and then the Prime Minister got up and suggested what his view of the Amendment was, and why he accepted it. He said—

> "It comes upon them, apparently, with a shock of astonishment, and they seem to think that this is sprung upon the House without the smallest preface or preparation."

It was a thing that had been carefully prepared in the speeches of the Prime Minister himself. How often had he spoken on the subject, he asked, and then he goes on to quote from a speech which he delivered on July 21st, as follows—

> "After all, secular education had something to do with national education. It was, he might remark, the main subject of the Bill, and it should not be left absolutely out of account, as being wholly alien. Religious education would be under the control, not of one man, and that man the parson of the parish, but of a board of six. Of these, the parson would probably be the only minister of religion, and three would be managers representing the denomination." [(4) *Debates*, cxi., 867.]

That was the view of the Government from the first. That is the thing which was bruited throughout the country to recommend the Bill There had been a suspicion that this was a Bill to give clerical control of schools sustained by public money. That was the first statement of the Prime Minister as to why he accepted this Amendment. Then he said—

> "It was never contemplated that the teaching in a Roman Catholic school should be otherwise than Roman Catholic, or that the teaching in a Wesleyan school should be other than Wesleyan, or that the teaching in an Anglican school should be other than Anglican."

That was, of course, accepted by my right hon. friend as meaning the tenour in the first part of the Clause. And then the Prime Minister goes on to say—

> "But I must traverse the contention of my noble friend that it was ever contemplated that the teaching should not be under the board of management. Surely it would be very inconsistent if that should be so, because what had been asked for all along was that a teacher should be elected with religious qualifications for carrying on denominational teaching."

Well, it is the board of management who are to elect the religious teacher, and not the ordained minister. In the case put of this terrible, tyrannical, Ritualistic, Squire, if he comes across a Low Church minister, he and his subordinates will appoint the schoolmaster, who will give the religious teaching. The whole thing is perfectly plain—that the Government had contemplated, and contemplated from the first, that against clerical control they should have the security of lay popular management, and it is in that way they justified the Bill to the country, and on that ground they accepted this Amendment as carrying out more distinctly the views they had always entertained. What does he say as to the bearing of this on the appeal to the Bishop? Does he say that the Bishop, and the Bishop alone, is to be the man who is to control religious teaching which is distasteful to the community? He says exactly the opposite. He speaks of the men whom he says are rare. I think they are increasing, and in my opinion they ought to be diminished, and that the people who ought to diminish them are the Bishops, and they have not done so. If they exist, what is to be done with them? The Prime Minister says—

> "What is it, I put it to them, that has raised almost all the difficulties in the public mind connected with religious teaching in our schools? It is the abuse, here and there, very rarely, I admit, by the clergyman of the parish of the powers given him by the trust. Wherever that was done the harm that it has done to the whole cause of religious education in our public elementary schools is, in my mind, not to be measured by words. I meet it at every turn and on every occasion. The follies and indiscretions of a single individual are multiplied by public rumour till they almost stand up as a great public danger. Is it wise to leave a system in existence [that is the present system of the clergy being controlled by the bishop] which can but bring the whole of our scheme of national education into discredit?"

Now mark this—

> "It is because I desire to see this danger removed forever from the path of religious denominational education that I am anxious to see the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend accepted."

That is the Government view of the remedy for this state of things, which has done incalculable mischief to the cause of education. They say it ought to be removed, and that it will be removed, by the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member. That was the ground on which they accepted the Amendment three weeks ago. The right hon. Gentleman said that if it is known that the Government—

> "Have done nothing whatever to see that the wishes of the parents of the children have been considered, there would be a strong feeling aroused against the great reform we are suggesting."

That is to say, that if this Bill provides no remedy for the mischievous religious teaching which is offensive to the parents there would be a strong feeling aroused against the Bill. Therefore he accepts this Amendment as the proper remedy for that mischief. How will doubling the priest by the bishop satisfy the people? Then the First Lord continued—

> "I do not pretend to maintain that in an absolutely theoretic sense these managers necessarily represent the parents. They are not elected by them, and, therefore, they do not represent them in that sense. But they will represent, broadly speaking, the general opinion of the particular denomination in a parish, and I think that if this Amendment is carried there really will be no danger that Anglican children will be taught a form of religion to which their parents heartily object."

In that sense the Amendment was accepted by the Government as representing the wishes of the community, giving the laity a voice which would not protect them against the clerical disposition in any case to go contrary to the feelings of the community. That is the principle the Government said they had always contemplated in their Bill, and they accepted the Amendment in the form in which it stands, because it carried out the clear intention that there should be a lay voice in directing the character of the religious education to be given to the children. I do not think anything can be clearer than that.

Of course, this was vehemently opposed by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, as we can readily understand, as being contrary to the principles he sincerely holds and which he always very powerfully presents. The question of trust deeds was raised, and the Secretary of the Education Department did not shrink from it. He said that trust deeds would have to be dealt with. But the Prime Minister dealt with the subject more directly. He said:

> "Trust deeds were necessarily dealt with and altered by the Bill."

Of course, when you determine that there shall be six managers, two of whom shall not be existing managers of the schools, it is impossible more completely to recompose trust deeds. You cannot have a more distinct violation of the trust deeds then the constitution of this Board of Management. It revolutionises the Board in all its most important particulars and that was pointed out by the Prime Minister most distinctly. He said :

> "We must all recognise that the Bill does involve some interference with trust deeds; some interference is inevitable. My noble friend has on the Paper words which, as I understand, preserve the control of the managers, but which would, as regards other powers, leave them subject to the trust deeds. If such an Amendment can be devised I have no objection to it. What I do object to is anything that interferes with the control of the managers. That is the essence of the Amendment. I do not think it is worth while persevering with anything short of that."

That is the control of the managers overrules the trust. There cannot be a doubt of that, because the right hon. Gentleman mentioned to the noble Lord the Amendment he would be disposed to accept—that any power as to religious instruction conferred by a trust deed on any minister of religion shall, subject to such control, remain vested in him. The proposal was at once rejected by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, who said that it was worse than nothing. I will not trouble the House with what followed. I wish the House to understand the position in which we stand.

What is the position of the Government in reference to the Amendment? They accepted it and it was confirmed by an overwhelming majority as carrying out their views? As I understood the Amendment, and as the House understood, it was to give lay control which should enable parents of children in the parish to prevent the giving of religious teaching which is offensive to the people of the parish. Well, are the Government of the same opinion now? What is the real meaning of this Amendment? What is the meaning of saying there is a difference between the doctrine and the machinery? The noble Lord dealt with that very well. The whole ecclesiastical system is a machine, and, therefore, to say that you are going to leave doctrine, and the character of the teaching dependent upon the doctrine, exclusively to the clergy with the bishops at their back is to run counter to the whole of the language hitherto held by the Prime Minister, and I think we have a right to ask what control the managers will have in this matter? The right hon. Gentleman said in this very speech that the absurdity of opposing this Amendment was that the managers when they desired to interest themselves in the school and who were excluded from meddling with the secular teaching which was the function of the education authority, would have nothing whatever to do except in regard to the question of appointing the schoolmaster, and that it was intended to give the managers this interest in the work of the schools. If the right hon. Gentleman thinks I am not accurately representing him, I have a passage here in which he made it a great part of his argument that these managers would have nothing to do unless we give them the sort of power conferred on them in this Amendment. That being so, I think we have a right to ask the Prime Minister what is the nature of the control in this religious instruction which he desires to give, and for which he accepted this Amendment. If this Amendment is really to assume a form by which, practically speaking, religious instruction is to remain solely with the parson and with the Bishop, then all the representations that have been made to the country that this is not to be a one-clergyman power goes for nothing at all. It is one-clergyman power. You talk of appealing to the bishops. What the bishops will practically have is a veto upon the managers, and to suppose that is giving to the laity in these matters the protection which it was supposed that this Amendment would give is an entire delusion. I hope any idea of that sort—of having gone back upon the recognition of the right of the laity to protection against solely clerical control—will be dispelled by the explanation which I am sure the Prime Minister will give to the House.

(10.10.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down filled up so much of his speech by lengthy verbatim quotations from my own utterances on previous occasions that I really am almost absolved from the necessity of making another oration upon this well-worn topic to the House. I have no change to suggest in anything that I have said before. The views that I entertained before I entertain now: the views that I expressed before I am ready to express again. I really think it was hardly worth while for the right hon-

Gentleman to occupy the House with these remains of previous speeches, and though I appreciate the compliment, I confess I think it might have been spared us on the present occasion.

So far as I understand the arguments that have been urged against the Amendment, they fall into three categories. The first I will mention is, I personally think, the least controversial, and in some senses and from some points of view the least important. It is that based upon the violation or alteration of the trust deeds by the present Amendment. Now, Sir, I do not in the least deny, and I do not in the least wish to minimise, the fact that many trust deeds are altered by the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend; and I think among many of my friends on this side of the House and among many gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House there is a genuine and well-founded jealousy of any rash interference with trust deeds, which are so important a part of the basis upon which property rests in this country. But let it be remembered that some alteration in the trust deeds of the primary education schools is absolutely necessary if you are to have this Bill, or anything like this Bill, at all. And let me further remind those who take a strong view upon this subject that an alteration more important, in my judgment, than any which this Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend contemplates, is of the very essence of this Bill, because—as I think I have pointed out in one of the extracts which the right hon. Gentleman has read—this Bill contemplates, and has from the first contemplated, that a third of the management of the voluntary schools should be appointed by outside authorities, and that, in regard to their appointment, there should be no limitation whatever as to the creed which they profess or the religious opinions which they hold. I cannot imagine a greater violation of the spirit of the original trust deeds in certain respects than this, and yet it is not only the principle of the Bill, but it is a principle of the Bill that has been endorsed by all the ecclesiastical associations—at least every Anglican, and, I rather think, every Roman Catholic association in England. They have all said, "If certain advantages are given us, we are perfectly prepared to see one-third of our management transferred to persons who are not necessarily of our creed." Really, is it possible after that to say that the trust deeds of the voluntary schools are not to be modified in connection with this Bill? It is of the very essence of the measure, and if my noble friend or my learned friend behind me who moved this Amendment, is prepared to answer and say, "No doubt this change in the trust deed was suggested, but it was suggested by the beneficiaries of the trust,"—I do not know whether I am using the right technical term—"by those who have obtained rights under the trust deed, and have a right to suggest an alteration against their own interest," then I say these are the trust deeds of individual founders of individual schools, and it no more rests with diocesan associations to suggest that they should be altered than it rests with any other set of private individuals. Therefore, if I may, I will dismiss at once this argument from the sanctity of trust deeds. Trust deeds are things with which this House ought to be most reluctant to interfere, but when we are remodelling the system of elementary education in this country, and when we wish to bring into that system the voluntary elementary schools which have hitherto carried on so much of the education in this country, I say that such a process is absolutely impossible unless you remodel the trust deeds. And if you adhere with this rigid orthodoxy to the absolute letter of the trust deeds with which you have to deal, your only choice——

Lord HUGH CECIL: Why do you respect them at all?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Your only choice is to leave the voluntary schools altogether outside your educational system, and leave my noble friend with the voluntary schools untouched, uncontaminated by any interference on the part of this House, and also without any part in the education of the youth of this country. My noble friend asks me why on this principle I respect any part of the trust deed. I utterly fail to understand him. He himself, I understand is an advocate of this one-third of extraneous management. At all events, he has never uttered a word against it, and all his friends have been in favour of it. Why does he respect any other provision in the trust deeds? My noble friend has gone further. My noble friend put on the paper of the House yesterday an Amendment which he did not move, but it is there for anybody to see. And this Amendment, if I understand it—my noble friend never lacks perspicuity—this Amendment suggests that we should institute a visitatorial committee, or authority, to be appointed, not by a clerical body but by a body on which laymen are largely represented, and, I dare say, in many cases laymen are in a majority. Is that to be found in any trust deed of a voluntary school? I have no complaint to make against my hon. friend, but I do not say that we could have accepted that Amendment if it had been moved——

Lord HUGH CECIL: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Though I might have been persuaded by my noble friend's silver tongue. But, at all events, the author of that Amendment ought not to attack us because, in a respect which we deem to be essential to the general coherence and consistence of our Measure, we have followed his example and suggested interference with existing trust deeds.

Now I leave what I profess to regard as the least interesting part, though not the less an important part of the question, and I come now to the second argument which I have heard advanced, and which I will call the lawyers' argument. The lawyers have taken a great part in this discussion; but they have not altogether agreed. Some critics have been rash enough to say that the fact that they have disagreed proves that this sub-Section requires remodelling. [An Hon. Member on the Opposition Benches: "Hear, hear!"] An hon. Gentleman says "Hear, hear!" Has he ever heard of any disputed sub-Section on which the lawyers have been agreed? I can truly assure the House that I never have; and the extraordinary thing is that the opinions of lawyers on the two sides of the House, with surprising regularity, coincide with the opinions generally held by their political friends.

*Mr. T. M. HEALY: Won't that be read by the the Irish judges?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: But may I be permitted to brush aside these legal subtleties, which are more appropriate to the discussion of Amendments to the sub-Section than of the sub-Section as a whole? It seems to me that the sub-Section as a whole is not difficult to understand, and the policy which has prompted our support of it is not difficult to explain. A great deal has been made in this debate of the fact that in the earlier controversies which we have had on this subject, very little was heard of the appeal to the Bishop. That is true. That is not what the House was interested in. In all these cases there must be a reference somewhere. In certain trust deeds it may be to the Bishop; in others, to another person; and where there are no trust deeds it must be to a court of law. But that is not the question in which the House was interested when we discussed the question before. The subject in which it was interested was whether the clergymen of the parish should have the sole control of the teaching in that parish, or whether that control should be shared by his colleagues on the managing body. That alone was the question before us, and on that I hope the Government gave no uncertain sound as to what their views were then and what they are now. There must be a reference somewhere, and personally I am distinctly of opinion that it is a very convenient course that the reference, in the case of the Anglican schools, should be to the Bishop. It saves a reference to a Court of Law, which is a very clumsy method. But the question is whether you should or should not put the management of religious teaching in these schools in the hands of the whole body of managers, or whether you should allow the management to remain in the hands of a single individual. I need not go further into the legal question. That will have to be discussed in detail, no doubt, on the Amendments. But it will be open to those who have an opportunity of speaking to point out wherein the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend falls short of or exceeds the explanation of his object, which we accepted when that Amendment was first brought forward, and which we are prepared to support now.

I now leave the second subject which has been in dispute tonight, and I come, with considerable searchings of heart and sinking of spirit, to the third subject, which I must regard as the theological branch of the inquiry. This is more difficult and serious. It touches finer issues than the subjects with which I have been dealing so far. I am bound first to refer to a speech made by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. He made a very interesting, touching, and eloquent address upon the aspect of this Amendment as it affects his co-religionists, and the substance of his argument amounted to this—that it was directly contrary to his faith that laymen should have any concern whatever in the settlement of matters pertaining to religion.

*MR. T. M. HEALY: I said that the clergy of our Church have a Divine commission.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My statement was not inconsistent with that. The hon. and learned Member thinks that the clergy alone should be entrusted with anything connected with the teaching of his faith. I have to admit that in theory the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend does run counter to that. It is perfectly true that if the managers, of whom a large number will be laymen, are given the control of religious education in the schools, the doctrine laid down by the hon. Member is departed from. That I do not minimise; nor is it for me to dispute the absolute accuracy with which the learned Gentleman has stated the beliefs of those who agree with him. But I do not think that in practice he will find that any damage or injury is done to those of his community in this country. He seemed to fear that Town Councils would be found which would endeavour in Roman Catholic schools, through the intervention of the representative managers, and possibly through the action of the foundation managers, to interfere with what was regarded as sound teaching. I think he need be under no alarm of that kind. I do not believe that there will be the smallest attempt on the part of Town or County Councils to do any injury to those of the hon. and learned Gentleman's creed any more than I believe the Roman Catholic laymen foundation managers on the board of management will for a moment interfere with the supremacy—that being part of their creed—of the bishops and the clergy of their Church. I do not know that what I have said will entirely remove the hon. Member's objections to the Clause as it stands, but I hope he will believe that, as far as the Government are concerned, and I believe as far as every man in the House is concerned, no matter on which side he sits, the last thing they desire is to use the machinery of the Bill to interfere with the teaching which the bishops and the clergy of the Church desire to give to their denomination in the schools.

I now come to the difficulties which have been felt, not by Roman Catholics, but by Anglicans, chiefly by friends of my own, as to the provisions inserted in the Bill. My noble friend the Member for Greenwich complained of the Attorney General because he distinguished in this Amendment between the Clause as it dealt with doctrine and with the Clause as it dealt with machinery, and he reproached the Attorney General with a great ignorance of ecclesiastical history in that in the first place he used such a word as machinery and in supposing that there was truly theological machinery except in Church administration.

LORD HUGH CECIL: No, I did not say that. I certainly said that what the Attorney General called machinery involves theological questions of the highest importance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite agree that questions of Church constitution involve questions of Church doctrine, but I thought he went further. But I do not wish to break a lance with my noble friend on the subject of Church history. I mention this sentence in order to notice what I think is the main fallacy of his contention. He has regarded this throughout as a strictly ecclesiastical question, and he has treated these denominational schools of the Church of England as if they were indistinguishable from the churches, as if they were as much an integral part of the ecclesiastical machinery of the Church of England as the cathedrals and the churches and the chapels which belong to that Church. I think my noble friend went the length of saying that as far as this Amendment was concerned he would have been content to consider that the schools were State schools and not Church schools, if the epithet applied to them by the late Home Secretary was accurate. It is not clear that the name makes a great change in the ecclesiastical aspect of this subject because my noble friend has mistaken the true root of the matter.

LORD HUGH CECIL: My objection was to calling the buildings State schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think these schools are neither State nor are they, in my noble friend's acceptation of the word, Church schools. They are public elementary schools belonging to the Church of England; that is their full style and title. I think my noble friend is making a profound mistake theologically, if he will allow me to say so, practically without admission, when he tries to sustain in this House the proposition that these schools, at all events as far as the religious hours of education are concerned, must be regarded as mere annexes or parts of the ecclesiastical fabric of the Church. I do not think so. I take a different view. I regard these schools not as annexes of the fabric of the Church, but as extensions, so to speak, of one aspect of the fabric. A most interesting speech was made earlier in the evening by my hon. friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington, who reminded the House, what every one knows, that Members of this House, to whatever denomination they belong, in educating their children do not think it necessary that the whole of the education should be carried on under the control of the parson of the parish. That is, I think, the real key of the situation. The poorer members of the community cannot command either the time or the assistance which the richer members of the community can command. They have not, unfortunately, the opportunity of teaching religion in the nursery, and in later life they have not governesses or tutors to teach them religion. They are obliged to send their children to school, and the school from the secular point of view is undoubtedly an annexe of the fabric, as I think it is also in point of religious teaching. That does not mean, of course, that the clergyman is not the natural adviser; it does not mean that it is not to him you would first go for assistance in dealing with these difficult and delicate questions. But it does mean that the clergyman is not supreme either in the family or in the school in the same sense as he is rightly supreme in the fabric of the Church. I venture to suggest most respectfully to those who take a different view whether they are not advancing a very dangerous doctrine if they try to persuade laymen of this country that, as regards their own co-religionists, they have the same kind of supremacy outside the Church as they have inside. Will not people say: "Ought they to have more supremacy in the Church than we are prepared to give them outside the Church?" I am not sure whether it is wise in the interests of the Church—I am sure it is not wise in the interests of the Church—that the doctrine of my noble friend and those who agree with him should be driven to the point which he appears to drive it. After all, have the clergy of the Church of England endeavoured to drive it to that point? My noble friend appears to draw no distinction between the Church and the school. What would be thought in the Church of a parson who merely gave a general superintendence, and the Church was represented by persons elected by a body in which laymen were in a majority, and the clergymen only had a right of general supervision and of preaching when he chose? That is what is done in schools. Remember, that in the Church of England schools at this moment, to an increasing degree, the teaching is carried on by the teachers of the schools, not because the clergyman of the parish is oblivious of his duty, not because he does not take the keenest interest in the welfare of the young members of his flock, but because as education becomes more specialised and more difficult the professional teacher gets an advantage, and the clergyman finds that the very doctrines which he desires to instil into the child are better instilled, on account of experience and the general discipline carried on in the school, by the lay teacher of the school. My noble friend must remember that an arrangement like that is subversive of the strictly ecclesiastical theory which he has desired to defend, and I do not think he is doing good service to the very cause he pleads by driving too far his speculative theories on this point. And may I remind the House that by the consent of everybody concerned—and I may include the learned Gentleman and his co-religionists in this country—the selection of the teacher has been committed, not to a clerical, but to a lay body, a body predominantly lay? We are told quite rightly that from the point of view of teaching in the school, it is the character of the teacher more than anything else that is important. When you have given the appointment of the teacher over to a body predominantly lay, how can you come down to this House and say that your ecclesiastical theories make it absolutely necessary that the clergyman of the parish or somebody in holy orders should have full control of your education?

Now, Sir, I must conclude, but I will conclude by making an appeal, not to this House, and not to the laymen in the country, but to that great body of clergy to whom the debt of every educationist is so immeasurably great. I know and I regret the pain which this Amendment has given to many of the most hard-working clergy of the Church of England, and to the priests of the Church of Rome. I know it, and I grieve over it. But surely, when they come to think of it, they will recognise that the wrongs of the Government towards them are small indeed. May I remind them—I can assure them and the House that I do not do so to get a merely argumentative advantage—of the kind of Resolution which they passed two years ago and three years ago on the subject of the controlling authority of the school? I am going to read a single paragraph from the Resolution of a joint conference of Convocation of Canterbury and York sitting in committee. The third paragraph runs as follows:—

> "That the government of every school, and especially the appointment and dismissal of the teacher, be left in the hands of the present committee of management, with the addition of certain members appointed by, or under rule made by, the local authority, such additional members not to exceed one-third of the whole number."

I do put it to all concerned if the clergy—the clergy, mark you, of the two great provinces—in passing that Resolution, reserved to themselves the right to object to such an intrenchment on this management as is involved by the rejection of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, if they had up their sleeve any reservation of that kind, if they were subsequently coming down and saying,—"It is quite true we did propose to hand over the management of the school and selection of the teacher to the denominational body, with a third added to it, but all the time we meant that if the trust deed was of a different tenour the whole education should be kept in the hands of one man," I think if they had done that deliberately, which I am sure they did not, we should have reason to complain. I believe they passed that Resolution absolutely in good faith. Certainly, when I introduced this Bill with Resolutions of that character before me, it never occurred to me, I can most truly say, although these controversies were very far advanced, that any objections would be raised from the side of the clergy to leaving to this mixed body, one-third external to the denomination, two-thirds belonging to the denomination — it never occurred to me that this mixed body, competent to elect teachers, was incompetent to deal with the religious education. I think we should have great reason to complain of the ecclesiastical authorities themselves, who, if they held these views at the time, did not give us some warning that it was in their mind.

Lord HUGH CECIL: No one so much as suggested at that time that the trust deeds would be altered. No one dreamt that the right of a clergyman to teach in his own school was to be removed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess I should not have thought that a body of men, who by their profession probably looked as much at the religious and ecclesiastical side of education as any other side, could pass this Resolution without knowing what it meant. My noble friend may have had the reservation in his mind at the time, but I had not any evidence of it. I can only say it never occurred to me. I did not hear a whisper of this difficulty until the end of July, after I had made a speech in this House in which I stated what my view of the Bill was. I am not accusing any human being of bad faith, I am only saying it is difficult to understand the ecclesiastical mind in defence of that position. But I have something much more to do than defend the Government. I have to say that in my judgment, thinking over this question and giving it the most serious consideration in my power, I am now more convinced than ever that the future of religious education in this country, so far, at least, as the voluntary schools of the Church of England are concerned, lies in the future, as it has lain in the past, with the clergy. If they refuse to work this Bill, as I have always conceived this Bill to be, and as I hope it will be when it is passed into law, then I admit that though this measure will in any circumstances do, I believe, an enormous service to the cause of general education in this country, it will not do all that I had dreamt it was capable of doing in the cause and interests of religious education. If the clergy take the view of my noble friend and the Bishop of Worcester and say, "This Clause interferes with the theory of episcopacy, and therefore we will not touch it," they have it absolutely in their power, in my judgment, to destroy the future of religious instruction, certainly religious instruction in the tenets of the Church of England, in our public elementary schools. But I believe more firmly in their devotion to religion and their public spirit. I am not going to pretend that this Bill will relieve—as was sometimes said in controversial moments by hon. Gentlemen opposite—the clergy of a great burden of labour, of troubles in respect to the collection of money, and other burdens, which they have borne during many years past. It will not remove that burden though I trust it will alleviate it. I admit that in parishes where the clergy and laity cannot work harmoniously together, scandals and difficulties may arise, though not of a character surpassing those which we have seen in certain cases under the existing system. I admit, also, that the clergy may feel that in a region in which they have hitherto regarded themselves supreme they may now have to share their powers, technically, and in some cases really, with a great body of laymen. But I am perfectly confident that in every parish where the clergyman shows that tact and moderation of which I believe the great majority of the clergy are capable and have given ample proofs, the system will work as smoothly and without friction in the future as it has done in the past; and that in the future, as in the past, those schools—infinitely better equipped in all secular matters—will not be less zealously concerned in the cause of those great religious truths for which the clergy of all denominations ought to, and, as I believe, do, earnestly strive.

(10.53.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 294; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 589.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bell, Richard
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James

Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, SirHoratioD (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDix'n
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Duncan, J. Hastings
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH (Maidstone
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Garfit, William
Gladstone, RtHn. HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. RobertWm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. SirWilliam
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH (Somerset, E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor (Sw'nsea
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lecky, RtHon. WilliamEdw. H.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leese, SirJosephF. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN. S)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lloyd-George, David
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt, Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Majendie, James A. H.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Meysey-Thomson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ (Walthamst'w
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Philipps, John Wynford
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Rigg, Richard
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, AbelH. (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, JamesParker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, RtHn. C. R (Northants
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Toulmin, George
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount

Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Webb, Colonel William George
Weir, James Galloway
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Austin, Sir John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Carew, James Laurence
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Purvis, Robert
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tully, Jasper
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Mr. Cripps and Sir James Fergusson.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 7, page 5, line 9, at end, add as a new sub-Section—'(5) The managers of a school maintained but not provided by the local education authority shall have all powers of management required for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall (subject to the powers of the local education authority under this Section) have the exclusive power of appointing and dismissing teachers.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

It being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to Part III. of the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 22, at end to insert as a fresh sub-Section the words—'(2) If, in the opinion of the Board of Education, any enlargement of a public elementary school is such as to amount to the provision of a new school, that enlargement shall be so treated for the purposes of this Section.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.10.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 590.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E.

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S,
Lowther, C. Cumb. (Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hon Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)

Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst

Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon John (Montrose
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whitley and Mr. Rea.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 10, page 6, line 4, at end, insert 'which, in cases where part only of a parish is situated in the area of the local education authority, shall be apportioned in such manner as the Board of Education think just.'"

"In Clause 10, page 6, line 15, after 'elementary,' insert 'day.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 6, line 33, to leave out the words 'Before such order is made, reasonable.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(11.23.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 98; Noes, 226. (Division List No. 591.)

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randall
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,RtHn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie,J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley,George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson,Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid.
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Hudd'rsfi'ld
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Charles Morley and Mr. Lough.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. HnGerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt,Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somerset,E
Hope,J. F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,Fav'rsham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.

Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G, Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederrck G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath

Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)

O'Doherty, William

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxeth)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, leave out 'thereof,' and insert 'of any such application.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, after 'draft,' insert 'final.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 34, after 'order,' insert 'proposed to be made thereon.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 36, leave out 'or,' and insert 'and.'"

"In Clause 11, page 6, line 38, at end of line, insert 'and the final order shall not be made until six weeks after notice has been so given'"—(*Sir W. Anson*).

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 16, at end, to add as a new sub-section the words—'(6) The Board of Education may, on the application of the managers of the school, the local education authority, or any person appearing to them to be interested in the school, revoke, vary or amend any order made under this section by an order made in a similar manner; but before making any such order the draft thereof shall, as soon as may be, be laid before each House of Parliament, and if within thirty days, being days on which Parliament has sat, after the draft has been so laid before Parliament, either House revolves that the draft, or any part thereof, should not be proceeded with, no further proceedings shall be taken thereon, without prejudice to the making of any new draft order.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(1138). Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes 214; Noes 91. (Division List No. 592.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Butcher, John George

Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile

Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc’r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William

Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd’x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf’rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somerset,E
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh’m

Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm’th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis(Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Macartney,RtHn.W.GEllison
Macdona, John Cumming
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt.Hn.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walth’mstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray,Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.

O’Doherty, William

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel,HnWm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George.
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ridley,S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,HC(North’mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M‘Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHnJ.G.(Oxf’d Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh’n,N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson,SirWilliam Edw.M
Tully, Jasper

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John

Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randall
Crombie, John William

Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. Inverness-sh..
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings

Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.

Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea

Kitson, Sir James

Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas

M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)

Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur

Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William (Snowdon)

Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants

Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfi'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Warner and Mr. George White.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 14, page 8, line 14, leave out 'local,' and insert 'public.'"

"In Clause 14, page 8, line 16, leave out 'a local,' and insert 'such an.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Further consideration, as amended, adjourned till Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 28th November, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Return for the month of October, 1902.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Report and Tables relating to Irish migratory agricultural and other labourers, for the year 1902.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2918. Switzerland.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into sentences passed under martial law.

COLONIES—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 372. British Solomon Islands. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Forty minutes sanctioning forms of instruction for certain county boroughs, counties, and urban districts. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 28th November, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, "That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from New Brompton, for abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Helmshore; Crawshawbooth; Chadderton; General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland; Hazelgrove; and Cheadle; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Speldhurst; and New Brompton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Bromfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Kilarrow; and Kilchoman; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented of Return of Proceedings during the month of October, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented of Agricultural Statistics of Ireland, with Report and Tables relating to Irish Migratory Agricultural and other Labourers for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented of Report No. 372 (British Solomon Islands, Report for 1901–2) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs can he explain the inconsistencies in the translation of the Sugar Convention of Brussels, exemplified in the use of one and the same English word as a translation of two different French words (as in Article I.), and of three different English words as a translation (as in Articles VI. and VII.) of one and the same French word; and can he explain what controlling books are; who is responsible for the translation; whether the French or the English is the binding text of the Convention, and particularly which is the binding text of Article X.; whether the French text—viz., "dans le cas où aucune des Hautes parties contractantes n'aurait notifié," or the English version—viz., "in the case of any of the high contracting parties not having notified"; and whether, in case it is the French text that is binding, the English translation thereof will be reconsidered and amended.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The apparent inconsistencies to which my hon. friend refers do not affect the general accuracy of the translation, and it is this which really signifies. If my hon. friend will explain to me in private his reasons for considering that in Articles I. VI. and VII. the French text (which is binding) has not been adequately reproduced, I shall be glad to consider his criticisms. The translation of the passage referred to in Article X. is, I am sorry to say, incorrect. The whole translation (which was made under great pressure in order that no time might be lost in presenting the Paper) will be carefully revised for reissue in the Treaty Series. The Secretary of State is constitutionally responsible for all Papers presented to Parliament on behalf of the Foreign Office. The controlling books are, I understand, records of the operations carried out in bond under Article II. maintained for the purpose of facilitating inspection. The technical term would appear to be "check registers."

Training of Poor Law Children—Utilisation of County Council Technical Staff.

MR. ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the extent to which Metropolitan and other boards of guardians use the technical classes of the London County Council and other County Councils for the training of poor law children in their charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) As regards London, I am informed by the London County Council that only one Metropolitan board of guardians have directly used the technical staff of the County Council for the training of poor law children. I have no definite information as to what has been done by other boards of guardians.

Education Bill—Continuous Liabilities of Municipal Corporations.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what, in the event of the Education Bill becoming law, will be the position of municipal corporations who, under the powers of the Technical Instruction Acts, 1889 and 1891, and the powers of expenditure conferred on such corporations of the grant under the Local Taxation (Custom and Excise) Act, 1890, have incurred continuous liabilities which may be objected to by the auditor of the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) If the liabilities referred to have been legally incurred in exercise of the powers conferred by the Acts mentioned, there will be nothing for the auditor to object to. If he disallowed any payment included in the accounts under audit as being in his opinion illegal, an appeal could be made to the Local Government Board against the disallowance, and the Board could then deal with the matter on equitable grounds. Further, if the auditor intimated that some item in the accounts before him appeared to him to be open to legal objection, application might be made to the Board to sanction such item, and if it was sanctioned no disallowance could be made.

Education Bill—Immediately Available Funds of Education Authorities.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the local education authority, having no funds at the time of the new Education Bill coming into operation, will be authorised to anticipate by overdraft on their treasurer the expenditure of the first six months of their existence, or until the authority shall have the opportunity of obtaining the necessary funds to meet their expenditure.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Local authorities are not legally empowered to overdraw their accounts with their treasurers. As regards the present case, I may observe that the funds belonging to any School Board or school attendance committee in the district of the local education authority existing at the appointed day will be transferred to that authority, and will be applicable to their expenditure under the Bill. Moreover, it will be competent to the authority to make arrangements beforehand for obtaining the funds required to enable them to defray their first expenditure under the Bill.

Donegal Trunk Telephone Service.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Postmaster General whether any guarantees have been given to the Post Office for the trunk telephone services established by the Post Office to the towns of Naas, Newry and Banbridge; if so, what are the annual amounts guaranteed for the trunk telephone to each town; and whether the guarantee is given by the urban councils of said towns, and, if not, by whom.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The National Telephone Company have undertaken to give a guarantee of about £112 a year for a trunk extension to Naas. The existing trunk line to Newry is provided under a guarantee of £68 15s. a year from the same company. A guarantee of £65 a year has been given by the urban district council for the Banbridge trunk line.

Aboyne (Aberdeenshire) Postmistress.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire W.): To ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been directed to the case of Miss Moggach, late postmistress at Aboyne, Aberdeenshire, who has just been compulsorily retired under the age clause after forty years of service; whether she was given to understand that the terms of her service entitled her to a pension; and whether he is prepared to reward her in some substantial way for years of active work.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am fully aware of all the circumstances of Miss Moggach's case. She was not given to understand that the conditions of her service were such as to qualify her for pension; but at the time of her retirement she was informed that her claim to a pension would be put before the Treasury. On further inquiry it was found that she was not qualified for any award under the Superannuation Acts; and in these circumstances I have no power to grant her any further remuneration in respect of her services.

London Telephones—Post Office and National Company's Systems.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.): To ask the Postmaster General if his attention has been called to the proceedings at a meeting of the London County Council on Tuesday last, when the Chairman of the Establishments Committee stated that the National Telephone Company had quoted a charge of £327 for certain work for which the Post Office charge was £430; and whether, in view of these statements, he will say whether the Post Office is able to afford in London as cheap a service as the National Telephone Company.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Yes, Sir, and I think the Post Office has some right to complain of the statement to which the hon. Member refers, as I had previously explained in a letter to the Council's Chief Engineer how the apparent discrepancy between the quotations of the Company and the Post Office arose. The Company already provide for the Council a considerable number of exchange lines and private wires, and on going into the matter they found that they could afford to make some reduction in the rentals of the latter. Their total charge for the whole of the service, including the new lines now required, but giving credit for the reduction on existing lines as above described, worked out at a net increase of £327 on the charge for the old service. The Post Office was asked for a quotation for the new services only, and the charge for those services was precisely the same as that made by the Company.

Transvaal Liquor Ordinance.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the Postmaster

General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he will state when the text of the new Transvaal Liquor Ordinance will be published.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The text of the Ordinance in question has been received, and will be published at an early date.

Irish Lights.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a letter written by Lieutenant Webster, R.N.R., to Elder, Dempster, & Co., calling their attention to changes in certain lights off the Irish coast, particularly to the Innishowen Red Lector Light at the entrance to Lough Foyle, the Tory Island Light, and Rotten Island Light, Killybegs; and whether, in view of the importance of these lights to navigators of the Irish coast, steps will be taken to have these errors rectified.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that their attention has been directed to Lieutenant Webster's letter, and his statements are being fully inquired into.

Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, prior to the opening of the Buncrana to Carndonagh Railway, arbitrators were appointed by his Department, in pursuance of Section 6 of The Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883; and whether, seeing that the Section only contemplated the appointment of arbitrators after the opening of the railway for traffic, he will explain why the Board of Trade appointed arbitrators prior to the opening of the line for traffic.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Section in question appears to contemplate the appointment of arbitrators at any time during the continuance of the guarantee, and before an appointment was made in the present instance an assurance was received from the Railway Company that the whole of the guaranteed capital had been raised.

Ichthyological Committee's Report.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): To ask the President of the Board of Trade when the Report of the Ichthyological Committee will be presented.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Report is in the hands of the printer, and will be presented with the evidence before the end of the Session.

Scotland—Women Employment in Bars.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): To ask the Lord Advocate whether he can grant the Return as to the employment of women at bars in Scotland, of which notice has been given, either in the form asked, or in any modified form.†

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Secretary for Scotland has no special information at his command which would enable him to grant a Return on the lines suggested by the hon. Member, but he understands that the census, which is now in process of compilation, will give the information desired.

Naval Boilers—Report of Recent Experiments.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when it is proposed to lay the Report on the trials of the "Sheldrake," "Fantôme," "Espiegle," and "Seagull," upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) I hope that this Report will be in the hands of hon. Members shortly before Christmas.

Riding Bicycles on Footpaths—Burnfoot Prosecutions.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of prosecutions and convictions at Burnfoot Petty Sessions against civilians during the twelve months ending the 1st day of October last for riding ordinary bicycles on the footpaths on the highways of that district, and the number of prosecutions and convictions at the same petty sessions during the same period against members of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

---

† The Return was as follows:—Employment of Women at Bars (Scotland)—Return of number of Women in Scotland who are (1) licence holders; (2) barmaids in public-houses; (3) barmaids in hotels, restaurants, and railway stations.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Fifteen persons, none of whom were members of the police force, were prosecuted at these sessions for the offence and during the period stated. They were all convicted. One member of the force has been prosecuted and convicted since the 1st October. The Inspector General has strongly censured this officer for his conduct.

Army Pensions—Proposed Weekly Payments.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any poor law unions of the United Kingdom have drawn his attention to the proposal to pay Army pensions weekly instead of quarterly as is at present the case, and urged on him that it would be to the interest of pensioners that Army pensions should be so paid; and whether he will consider the advisability of adopting this change.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) This question has been frequently considered and fully answered in the House. The great majority of pensioners prefer the present system, and, as it is extremely doubtful whether the change proposed would be advantageous, there appear to be no sound reasons for adopting the course proposed in recent communications from certain poor law unions.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

(12.10.) MR. RIGG (Westmoreland, Appleby) said the object of the Amendment he had to move was to provide for the selection of, at least, a majority of the education committee from the popularly-elected body, the County Council, and for the co-optation of a minority from without, selected, not as representatives of associations and organisations, but on the ground of individual qualifications and merits. Seeing that the great powers and duties vested by this Bill would be exercised by practically an unknown body, surely it was fair and reasonable to ask Parliament to clearly and properly define the exact composition of the body. During the debates they had contended for direct popular control of public money, and it was not asking much that half the education committee should be selected from a popularly-elected body. They were told the County Councils would select the education committee, but the Board of Education had power to alter the proposals of County Councils, and secure, for certain organisations and interests, large influences on the education committee. Bodies so composed would have a tendency to be weak in initiative, and only have power and influence in resisting and retarding the progressive development of education. They would tend to be subservient to private interests, and to neglect and disregard the interests of the public. They would be tempted to avoid the expense of providing suitable schools, and be pressed to waste money by giving subsidies to institutions maintained to promote private and sectarian interests. Every well-regulated County Council had a committee of selection as the House of Commons had, and they should trust the County Councils as the education authorities. The Amendment would provide for a minority added by a popularly elected authority for advice and assistance, appointed for their expert knowledge as teachers, as persons having practical experience, and who had done valued work. It would give sufficient power for expert representation, and be distinctly preferable to the system under which persons would be nominated by vested interests for the protection of vested interest against public interest. The education committee might consist entirely of outsiders. There need not be a single member of the County Council upon it, but it could not consist exclusively of members of the Council. There should, at any rate, be genuine co-optation by the County Council. During the fourteen years the County Councils had been in existence, they had shown an independence and an intelligence which would justify us in giving them the free, unfettered selection of the education committee. If the Bill became law, the Council would have few educational functions, the only permanent duty being to levy rates at the bidding of a body largely nominated by organisations not subject to the ratepayers. These bodies would be free from the healthy, stimulating influence of direct popular election, and be free from the effective control now exercised by the Board of Education. It was unwise to encourage competition between the various societies and associations for representation, and for seats on the education authority. The system of the Bill would diminish the popular voice, allow vested interests to entrench themselves in the education authority, it would be productive of interminable conflict of sectarian strife, and not make for the public good and for the interests of education as a whole.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 14, to leave out the words from the word 'committees,' to the end of the Clause, and insert the words 'consisting of members of the Council who shall have power to co-opt other persons of both sexes to serve on such education committee or committees, but the total number of such co-opted members shall be less than half the total number of members, and any Council may delegate to such committee such of its powers as it thinks fit."—(*Mr. Rigg*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 15, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said he had only been elected a Member of the House during the present year, since the introduction of the Education Bill in the King's Speech, and he had not ventured to express any opinion about it. He did not want to add to the floods of oratory which had wearied Members on both sides of the House, but for a few moments he asked indulgence while he put before them a short point of view with regard to the large county boroughs. What was the best way of composing these education committees, and of working them from the large city point of view? He thought the object of the Bill was to find what was the best educational machine. The beauty, in his opinion, of the Government plan was that there was a certain amount of elasticity about it. Clause 18, as amended by the Committee, left it almost entirely to the local authority to say how the education committee should be composed, and he thought rightly so, because one place differed from another in its requirements. He was going to speak in a moment as to the large amount of work which the large Corporations of England had at the present moment to do, and he thought one of the strongest arguments from the other side of the House was that these large corporations had as much as they could do—and his object in speaking against the Amendment was to try and confirm the Government scheme of giving elasticity, and of allowing the large corporations to appoint their committee as they thought best, and not to compel them to have a majority of their own members on that committee. Perhaps he might speak with some little authority. He had had the honour of a seat on the Sheffield Corporation for the last fifteen years, and he had only just retired from the Corporation with reluctance, owing to his inability to attend to his duties in the House and his duties there. He had had the honour of being Lord Mayor three years ago, and during that year he attended almost all the meetings of the committees and of the Council, and those Members who were acquainted with the working of our large cities would know the work had increased enormously of late years. During the last ten or fifteen years Sheffield had acquired large revenue-producing undertakings, and other large cities had done the same—gas, water, electric light, tramways, markets, increasing the work of these Corporations immensely. He did not think he was overstating it if he said that the work had doubled, but the individual personnel of these Councils had not doubled. It remained pretty much as it had been for a long period, and in some of the large Corporations the numbers stood as at first named in their charters of incorporation. He had before him a list of ten of the large cities of England, in which the numbers of the Corporations varied from 64 to 112. He believed that in Liverpool they had been slightly increased lately—he did not know whether any of the Members for Liverpool were in the House—but they had 112, Manchester had 110, Birmingham 72, Leeds, Sheffield, Leicester, 64, and so on. In some way or another the work of these large Corporations must be relieved—and he believed the proper way was by co-opting, by allowing them to form these educational committees in the way that seemed to them to make the best working machine for their own place. There was another way in which they could relieve the tension, and that was by delegation. The Amendment dealt with that subject, as also did the Government Clause, and they wanted to make use of that system of delegation. They wanted to avail themselves of the services of those who had done such valuable work on our School Boards. He wanted to admit to the fullest extent the most valuable work these gentlemen had been doing. They did not want to lose the services of these gentlemen, they wanted to retain their services, and in his opinion the best way to do so was to delegate, so far as they could, the power of the local authority to the education committees. There was a gentleman who was well known to the Education Department in London, who had been sent for from the city of Sheffield to have his advice given to them. He had been chairman of the School Board, had done most excellent work, and had joined both parties together with the best results. That gentleman, unfortunately, was leaving, but he had written to ask him his opinion of what would be the result of co-opting members, and then only taking them as advisers, and not allowing them any kind of administrative power, and the reply was—

> "The confirmation or rejection of the education committee's minutes month by month, however delightful in theory, I am afraid would be unworkable. It would rob the education committees of all proper sense of responsibility, and co-opted members would find their position unbearable, and would eventually decline to act. I think the education committee should present its budget to the Council half-yearly, seek its sanction for its main provisions, and be dependent on its concurrence for its authority. But if the budget was accepted by the Council the committee should have a perfectly free hand in all matters of administration, reporting for information only to the Council its proceedings."

It might be said that if delegation to that extent were adopted the Council would not be carrying out its duty, and would lose touch with what was going on. He did not think so, because the education committee would be appointed annually in the same way as the other committees of the Corporation. Of course it depended upon what scheme was adopted, but if this committee was elected annually, as in his opinion it must be, surely that was sufficiently keeping in touch with the work of that committee. They could not spend more money than the Corporation approved of, because the estimates came before the Council, and if they did anything that the Council did not approve of, the Council had its remedy the next November by appointing another committee. He must thank the House for the very kind way in which they had listened to him. He was sorry to have to oppose the Amendment, but he must do so as a matter of duty, and he hoped he might urge on the Secretary to the Board of Education that he would adhere loyally to the scheme of the Bill, which gave elasticity to the Corporations.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he would like to congratulate his hon. friend the member for the Appleby Division on having at last successfully broken the silence he had so long maintained. The hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division had dealt with a very interesting question — viz., whether co-opted members chosen by the Council would have a thoroughly free hand and be able to work for the views which they held. He fully admitted that there was a danger of the co-opted members feeling that they had not a free hand to carry out their own educational views. He was speaking of what had been the experience in connection with certain corporations he could name, though he was not allowed to do so. In those cases co-opted members had felt that they were rather too much the servants of the Council, and that was the reason why he had always been in favour of making it a statutory obligation that the majority of the members of the committee should be members also of the Council. He knew that that was the wish of the Government and that it would be carried out, but he did believe it was necessary that the majority of the committee should be members of the Council. He agreed with the hon. Member who moved the Amendment that it was desirable the Council should have a little more freedom than it had under the Clause as it stood. He agreed with the desire that the Council should be tied down to appoint a majority of its members on the committee. But he must remind the House that there was a considerable difference between the councils which would have to appoint the committees or make schemes for them. There were the big councils and big county boroughs which might probably be absolutely trusted in the matter, but then there were also some smaller county boroughs which he thought might obtain some advantage in drawing up their schemes from the friendly assistance of the Board of Education. He could not vote for the Amendment as it stood, because he did not want to strike out the whole of the Clause. There were a number of provisions in the Clause which he wished to see retained. For instance, there was the statutory obligation that women should be members of the committee; there was the sub-Section dealing with the exclusion of those who held offices of profit under the Corporation or under the committee, and there were the sub-Sections as to the desirability of appointing members of the present School Boards, with separate and joint committees. He therefore urged his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment and to allow the question to be further discussed on the Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, or on that of the hon. Member for Rugby.

*(12.30.) THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said he would state as briefly as possible the reason why the Government could not accept the Amendment so clearly put before them by the hon. Member for the Appleby Division. That reason was that the Amendment proposed to destroy the machinery for the constitution of those committees which was settled not long ago by the House after full debate. The Government thought that this machinery was, on the whole, the best that could be devised for collecting the educational interest and the intelligence of an area on behalf of the local education authority, and in bringing to bear such assistance as the Board of Education could give in finally framing a satisfactory scheme. It had been suggested that the County Council ought to be required to place upon its committee a majority of their own members, and it was even suggested that if they had any latitude in this respect the result might be that no single member of the County Council would be placed on these committees. Personally he had no fear that the County Councils] and the local education authorities would so far depart from their duty as to be unwilling to accept a responsibility in this important matter, and, by declining to take part in the deliberations of the education committee, throw the whole burden of responsibility of giving the advice on which they must act for the educational purposes of their area on a body on which they were not themselves represented. He had no doubt that the County Councils would take their full share of the duties which it was proposed to throw upon them, and for the reasons set forth by the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division, he did not think it was fair to put pressure upon them, to fetter their discretion in the matter, by saying that there must necessarily be an absolute majority of their own members. The Government had clearly indicated in the Bill that their wish—and he believed it was also the wish of the House—would be that there should be such a majority; and inasmuch as the County Council could only decide that there should be less than a majority by a deliberate vote, he thought there were sufficient safeguards to secure that it should be adequately and fully represented on any committee. The Government had given the County Councils full power of delegation, and that power they might exercise as they pleased. Their relations with the education committee would be determined by themselves. The budget of the education committee for example, would be considered at such times and seasons as they thought proper, but the ultimate responsibility must rest with them for whatever powers they conferred on the education committee, they were responsible because they were the final financial authority of the area, and they were responsible to the ratepayers for carrying out the recommendations of the education committee The Clause, the Government thought, fairly represented the relations which ought to subsist between the local education authority and the education committee, and under the circumstances they could not accept the Amendment.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said the main point of his hon. friend's Amendment was the assertion that the majority of the members of the local committee should be really representative of and responsible to the people of the area served, whether borough or county. With that object he thoroughly sympathised, and if the Amendment were pressed he should vote for it. But the Amendment would have to be supplemented by further machinery to provide the working basis which was desired. He was greatly struck by the able speech of the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division, who had had long practical experience in the work of that great municipality, and who advanced from the facts of the case very strong arguments which might be used, not only against the principle of the Amendment, but also, it appeared to him, against the principle of the Clause, for he asserted that many Councils already had too much work to do, and that thanks to the entrance of municipalities into various fields of administration and constructive work for the welfare of the people, their duties were rapidly increasing. That argument might be pressed a good deal further than it was. It logically led up to the system which obtained in many great cities in the United States, where the Town Council was the central body responsible for the financial machinery of the work of the education in its district; and, following out the idea suggested by the hon. Member, the Town Council either directly or through the Mayor appointed a Board of Education, specially chosen solely for the one object of education, to deal with the administrative work for all grades of classes and schools. If such a system could be introduced here he would prefer it to the procedure of the Bill. As matters stood he was disposed to support the Amendment, however, because it asserted the principle of direct responsibility on the part of the majority of the education committee to the ratepayers electing the Town or County Council. But if they could have the American system, either in the form of the direct responsibility of a body appointed by the Town or County Council wholly devoted to educational purposes, or, still better, in a directly elected body like the School Board, that would be an infinitely better solution.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said he wished to state the opinion of the County Councils on this Clause, so far as it was expressed at a very large meeting of the executive of their association on Wednesday last. As far as he could ascertain, the County Councils had no objection to the proposed addition of experts nor to the scheme being framed for the committees. He should be sorry to see the scheme of the Government materially modified, as proposed by the Amendment. The County Councils, however, almost unanimously objected to the scheme of the Government on the ground of its element of compulsion in respect of nomination by outside bodies. To meet the objection some of his hon. friends had put down Amendments to add the words "desirable to the Council." Let the Government consider what would happen if they insisted on retaining this compulsory element. It was practically certain that many Councils, some of them the most important and influential, would send up schemes not containing a power of nomination to any outside body, but containing a list of representative men and women whom they deemed it desirable to appoint. Were the Government going to insist that in every one of those schemes there should be a power of nomination given to certain outside bodies? If it was not intended to insist, then the Government ought to accept the proposed modification, but if it was intended to insist, then it would be necessary to introduce a Provisional Order Bill giving the power of nomination to outside bodies. The County Councils would undoubtedly resist its passing. The matter would be debated on the floor of the House, the Bill would go to a Private Bill Committee upstairs, and it would be left to that Committee to say what was desirable. What, he would like to ask, would be the position of those nominees when they came to sit on the education committee, having been put on against the will of the County Council? Surely it would be neither so satisfactory nor influential as if they had been willingly co-opted by the Council. They would be put on as the representatives of particular interests, and would confine their attention to the point of view of the body which put them on. He could conceive nothing more likely to inspire a spirit of jealousy between the committee and the Council than the fact that some members were put on by outside bodies against the will of the Council. It would be most unfortunate if such a spirit of jealousy were created. He begged the Government, in the interests of the harmonious working of these institutions, to consider the almost unanimous view of these county bodies in this matter—a view in which the county boroughs very much coincided.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said his hon. friend had stated with great moderation what they felt to be the fundamental objections to the scheme contained in the Clause. One of these was the enormous amount of work which would be entailed on the Councils, whose time was already so fully occupied. No one who knew anything of what that work was could fail to see that this was a very hazardous experiment. Another objection was that these bodies, as it was proposed to constitute them, would not spring from the people—they would not be popularly-elected, and would not feel themselves directly responsible to the people. The answer made was that the County and Borough Councils would be responsible for the spending of the money, although it would be able to delegate its administrative duties to the committee. But the difficulty of that was that the responsibility of the Council would be a responsibility without knowledge. The business would be so heavy and so detailed that it would be quite impossible for a body like a County or Borough Council to keep in touch with it, and therefore, when it came to review the proceedings of the committee, it would either have to confirm the work of the committee without sufficient inquiry, or it would have to reinvestigate all questions from the very beginning. They had continually raised that difficulty, and he doubted if even yet the Government appreciated the importance of it. These considerations would dispose him to vote for the Amendment, but he was bound to admit that it cut out a great deal that might well be retained, and on that ground he supported the suggestion of the hon. Member for Oldham, that it should be withdrawn. He regarded the scheme of the Clause as good in so far as it permitted variety of play to meet the conditions of different counties and boroughs, but as regarded that part which gave power to the Board of Education to put on representatives of interests against the will of the County Council, there was much weight in the objections urged by the right hon. Member for East Somerset. It was all very well to say that the councils had the duty of drawing up schemes in the first instance, but, after all, the man who had the last word was the man who prevailed. Here the last word was given to the Board of Education, and the Government could force through any scheme which the Board of Education confirmed. He felt that the nominees of outside bodies might come in, not as representing the people or the interests of education, but as representing all kinds of schools, or, perhaps, particular denominations. They would not be animated by a general zeal for education, or else that general zeal would have only a secondary place with them, and above everything else they would be the champions of their own particular interests. He hoped, therefore, that in the last hour of the last day the Government would reconsider their position in the matter, and would abandon the proposal enabling the Board of Education to put on the committee people against the will of the Council. He was sure that if the Councils were convinced by the arguments of the Board of Education that there was a *bonâ fide* case made out for giving representation to certain interests, their public spirit would induce them to assent to any proposal of that kind, and there would be consequently no need for compulsion. The system as it stood had not in it the elements of permanency. He feared that it would be found necessary in a very short time to amend it. The only way in which the system would work was by a large devolution of the powers from the education committee to sub-committees, and the more that was done the more would there be a departure from the original intention of the Bill and from the principle of popular responsibility.

*(1.5) Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) hoped that the House would allow him

to say a few words on this subject, which was one of deep interest to all interested in the practical work of education. He highly valued this Clause, because it gave both variety and elasticity. It gave variety to meet the wants of various places, and it gave elasticity because there was power to modify a scheme as new conditions arose and new circumstances occurred. He was sure that any system of a cast-iron character would be inadequate, and that legislation would be required at an early date in order to make this new system in accordance with the requirements of the age. He did not himself feel any danger whatever of gentlemen or ladies elected from the outside advocating any particular interest. In the West Riding of Yorkshire he was a member of some of the most important grammar school authorities. They had representatives from the University of Cambridge and other bodies, and they had not found the slightest difficulty arising from the composite character of these bodies. These represensatives brought to bear high culture, and members representing other districts brought their knowledge of agriculture and commerce, and so on through the whole field; and he was perfectly sure, having had long experience of these bodies, that they would not wish to push any particular interest. The Report of the late Secondary Education Commission distinctly recommended appointments from outside. Among those to whom they desired to give the power of appointment was the central authority. The great corporations of Liverpool and Manchester had committees of various kinds. These committees went through details with the most minute care, and he believed that these great corporations, having trust in the committees as regarded details, found their confidence in that trust was not misplaced. The system worked admirably in the great corporations of Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, and Bradford, and if it had been found to work admirably in these cases it would not be less satisfactory in the case of education. They had already had experience, because the great County Councils—he was speaking of personal knowledge—of Lancashire and Yorkshire, through their technical instruction committees, had dealt with a great variety of detail. The conduct of details was entrusted to the committees, and the committees executed their work with wonderful diligence and skill, and the result had been eminently satisfactory. He hoped that the decision of the House would be in conformity with what he believed to be a useful and comprehensive Clause.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said all must agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen that the position of members co-opted against the will of the Council on bodies like the education committees would be far from being satisfactory. The case was indeed much stronger than it had been put by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset. Co-opted members on these bodies were always subjected to attack on occasions when they interfered in matters which could possibly involve the expenditure of the ratepayers' money and told they were not entitled to speak. The House had been placed in a position of extraordinary embarrassment by the changes which had been made in the Bill since it was first introduced. The substitution of the word "Council" for "education authority" in many parts of the Bill had altered the original scheme of the Bill, which was that the committee should be the local education authority. [Mr. BALFOUR dissented.] Then what was the meaning of the change? He thought it was an almost charitable explanation of the extraordinary complexity of the Clause. He would not, however, further press that point. But the part of the Clause which seemed to him more deserving of censure was that which related to the schemes. The new County Councils—the first under the operation of the Education Bill—would not be elected before March twelve months. Therefore these schemes would be approved by the Board of Education and pushed through before County Councils with a mandate under the Education Bill came into existence. That to him was the great objection to the proposed schemes—they would be carried behind the backs of the people before the people were given a chance of expressing their opinions with regard to them. The democratic side of the Bill was destroyed by that plan, for the schemes would be established behind the backs of the electors before they had an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion on them.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Appleby Division referred to both portions of the proposed education committee—the non-co-opted part as well as the co-opted part—and therefore they had to glance at those parts of the Bill which the Amendment would displace. As regarded the co-opted part, the Bill provided that members brought in under the scheme of nomination by outside bodies should be appointed by the Council. All along he had had great doubts as to the meaning of these words. The words, "for the appointment by the Council on the nomination, where it appears desirable, of other bodies of persons of experience in education," either meant that the Council was to have an option of rejection or they meant nothing. He hoped there would be an opportunity later on of having that point cleared up. As regarded the non-co-opted part, it must be put on record at this stage that the present Amendment, if accepted, would make the discretion of the County and City Councils less than it was under the Bill. Hon. Gentlemen opposite argued as if the Bill was to compel the County and City Council to elect persons on the non-co-opted part of the committee who were not members of the Council itself. Nothing of the kind existed. The only question was whether the option of going outside the Council, or being compelled to elect councillors, and councillors only, should be decided at Westminster or entrusted to the Councils. He thought the Opposition ought to show more confidence in these Councils.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that unless the right hon. Gentleman intended to support the Amendment, his last words constituted a very extraordinary conclusion of his speech, for the whole contention of the Opposition was that confidence should be placed in the Councils; that they should be allowed to prepare their own schemes, select their own committees, and not be compelled to put upon them the nominees of outside bodies. There had been a considerable change of attitude by the Government with regard to these committees since the Bill was originally drafted, and a change, he thought, for the better. At first it was proposed to set up an independent statutory committee, more or less on the lines of the Welsh governing bodies. They were to be the real authority, and the County Council was only to have the power of nomination and probably the preparation of the scheme. But now the County Council was to be the real authority; it would have the power of revoking or rejecting any of the proposals made to it by the committee. That surely made a great difference in the question of the powers of the Council in regard to the appointment of the committee. He thought there was great force in what had fallen from the right hon. Member for East Somerset. It was one thing to leave it to the Council to co-opt experts, and to invite the assistance of representatives of other bodies, but it was quite another matter to force these men on the Council. He thought they might even now reconsider their attitude, and leave it to the Councils to select their own committees. He believed that they would carry out the general idea of the Government by inviting the assistance of educational experts. But to force them to do that would do a great deal of harm. If the Government declined to give way to that extent, why should they not confine the selection of members to other elective bodies, such as the Parish Council, representing portions of the same body of ratepayers? It was, no doubt, intended that representatives of denominational schools should be on the committees. That, he thought, was very unfair, because the supporters of voluntary schools would have also to deal with the provided schools, and would thus have a double representation on the committee. Let the County Councils have a free hand with the constitution of the committee. They would not be likely to choose men all of one colour or political complexion. The Welsh County Councils were supposed to be very partisan by people who did not know them, but almost without exception they had given the Conservative minority proportionate representation on the aldermanic bodies, and he believed that, acting on the same principle, the Councils, in appointing the education committees, would see that the interests of voluntaryism were adequately represented. After all, he believed that three-fourths of the existing Councils contained a majority of Conservatives, and surely the Government ought to feel able to trust them to deal with these matters.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said that the main difference between the proposal of the Government and the Amendment was that the Government scheme was mandatory, while the Amendment was permissive. Under the Bill of 1896 co-optation was to be permissive, and the strongest objection was then raised in all quarters of the House, and outside as well, many Amendments being put down to substitute "shall" for "may." He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset supported the Amendment.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: I did not support it.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said he was glad to hear that. He only heard a portion of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. What he wanted to point out was that County Councils had power now to co-opt outside persons to serve on technical committees, but the majority of councils had kept the work entirely in their own hands. He strongly supported the Government scheme, because it secured that the two elements, common-sense and expert knowledge, would always be combined on these committees. Judging from the experience of the last ten years large numbers of County Councils would decline or neglect to co-opt, and thus they would lose the valuable aid of men interested in educational work, which he hoped would be forthcoming if the Clause as it now stood were adhered to. It was suggested that there was strong objection to the Government scheme on the ground that the persons nominated by the various organisations would act solely in the interests of those organisations; that they would represent a small section only of the community, and would not have the interests of the county at heart. He was ot sure that the Amendment was not open to the same objection, and he had a strong suspicion that it had originated in the council of a small organisation, and had not been submitted to the general electorate of that council. The persons representing educational organisations would also represent a large section of the community interested in the work. It appeared to him that there were two very strong objections to this Amendment. In the first place it came forward very late in the day and was an entire reversion of the Government scheme; and in the second place, leaving the power in the hands of the authorities without compelling them to exercise it, would cause a loss which the Government proposal avoided—that was, the loss of the expert knowledge which the county governing bodies had secured in Wales, and which he trusted would be secured by the county governing bodies in this country. There was no section of this Bill which commanded his support more strongly than this proposal that the various county authorities should proceed by schemes. Having regard to the educational work in various parts of the country, it was essential that Parliament should avoid imposing upon every area exactly the same system. Rigidity was almost impossible, and would mean years of loss to educational work. The various localities should frame their schemes, complying only with the general lines laid down by Parliament, and the Government proposes to put into their hands power whereby Dorset might frame a scheme for that county, and Birmingham might frame one slightly on different lines more suitable to education of a progressive character. There was elasticity by this plan which would make for the advancement of education. Recognising that there must be elasticity in local action, he asked—were they likely to improve matters by adopting the Amendment before the House? The Government plan was the scheme which had been carried out for years by the London County Council. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had described the scheme practised by the London County Council. The Technical Committee of that body consisted of twenty members, fifteen of them being co-opted from the various educational and trade organisations. Those organisations had some knowledge of the needs of the schools, and power was given to them to submit to the

County Council the names of suitable persons to serve upon the Technical Committee. The London County Council could take those nominations and appoint them, or they had power to refer them back for more suitable names. He did not know what was the exact legal effect of the words "for appointment on the nomination of." Did those words imply that the County Council had the right to refuse those particular persons? If not, the words were unnecessary and misleading. He had always read this Clause to mean that when the scheme was prepared, the County Council would set forth in the scheme the names of the persons nominated by the various local organisations who, in their opinion, should be entrusted with the right of nominating persons. That scheme would be sent up to the Board of Education, and what would take place? What had been the experience of the last few years? The Board of Education in case of disputes would make suggestions to the local authority which they would accept in most of the cases. They might be able to show good grounds for not including some particular organisation, and where they could show good cause, the Board of Education would very rarely insist, only when there was an obvious intention to exclude some organisation which deserved recognition; and only in such cases would the Board of Education insist, and they should have this power to insist. That was insistence on the right to nominate and not to appoint a particular individual. In the interests of educational work throughout the country he felt bound to give the Government scheme his most cordial support as against the Amendment, although he should be glad to know what was the exact signification of the words "for appointment by the Council on the nomination, where it appears desirable, of other bodies." It ought to be made clear that in case an organisation set up an objectionable person the Council could refuse to accept that particular nomination. At the end of three years the same organisations might submit other persons for nomination, and he wished to know if the Council could reject those individuals if they desired, and could they ask the various organisations to reconsider their nominations? If the Council had not this power, other persons might be placed upon the committee to whom the Council might have the strongest objection, and who might go to the committee with the intention of making themselves disagreeable, and producing a deadlock which would cause very serious injury to the schools. If the County Council had the right to reject an individual nomination and complete power of appointment, which also implied power of objection, then, to his mind, the House would be well advised in accepting the Government scheme as a whole.

(1.40.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said the hon. Member opposite had raised some very serious points upon the present framework of the Bill. Two of them were worthy of attention. First of all, the hon. Member had assumed that there would be many County Councils who would not appoint any outsiders at all. He did not know upon what grounds that expectation was founded. Certainly his experience in the matter in regard to technical education committees had been in the opposite direction. By this proposal the Government were forcing outsiders on to the County Council against their will, and he asked was such a system likely to work well? He should have thought that such a proposal would have been fatal to the working of the Bill. He thought County Councils generally would be only too happy to co-opt members who were experienced in educational matters, but they were now forcing upon the education authority a constitution which they disliked and which they would be very likely to resist. Thus there would be at once friction between the County Council and the Education Department, who would probably force upon them persons whom they disliked. That was not a very promising prospect for starting this Education Bill. He was disposed to agree with the contention of the hon. Member for North-West Ham in regard to the words "appoint on the nomination." That made the provision still less agreeable, because if they were to appoint on the nomination of outside bodies, and if they had no voice whatever in the appointment of the person so nominated, this was likely to be very much resented, and it would make the working of the Bill much more difficult. They ought to have it made clear what was the meaning of those words. There ought to be an

Amendment to get rid of the awkward term "nomination," and he suggested the word "recommendation." Perhaps that word would be less offensive. He agreed that nothing would be more likely to cause friction than the fact that these outside bodies, who would have nothing in common with the Council, should be allowed to nominate strangers to the county and strangers to the body with whom they would have to work. By this means they would be importing into the executive committee of these bodies individuals who would be looked askance at by those whom they had to join on the committee. If that was true as to co-optation generally, it would also apply to the nominees of denominational bodies. The hon. Member for North West Ham had truly said that the denominational nominees put on these committees against the desire of the County Council might make the working of the Bill entirely incongruous and inharmonious. Therefore, the House ought to have a distinct answer from the Government as to what under these words was the choice to be left to the County Council with regard to the individuals, both when put on the Committee against their wish and when put there without their consent. If these members were found not to work well with the County Council, would there be any power to remove them, or would they be fixed there against the will of the County Council, however ill they might work with them? That was a thing the House ought to understand. Another point raised by his right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean, was extremely important. They ought to be told definitely how long these schemes were to last. The schemes would be framed by the County Councils elected before the passing of this Bill. In two years from this time there would be County Councils constituted with a full knowledge of the Bill as it was working. Would these Councils have power to present new schemes if they thought fit? Unless they had power to come to the Education Department and ask approval of a new scheme in lieu of one which had not worked well there might be perpetual warfare in the education committee, and the County Council would be powerless to place it on a footing which would be workable.

*MR. KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood) said he was most anxious that this Bill should work well, and he hoped the Government might accept the principle of this Amendment so as to avoid friction on the County Councils. The Executive Committee of the County Councils Association decided the other day that they did not wish to have members forced on these committees against their will. He believed that if they had those members forced on the committee contrary to their will it would give the greatest trouble in the County Council, and the greatest dissatisfaction among the electors. He had had some experience of County Councils. He sat on the Lancashire County Council for three years, and on the Technical Education Committee, and he knew they would resent most strongly any forcing of their powers. Why not trust the County Councils? They had worked admirably well, and if the Government now said that they dare not trust the County Councils, it looked at any rate as if there were something behind the action of the Government which would not bear the light of day. He was anxious that the co-opted members should have the greatest force and strength in the committee, but if they were to be on the committee contrary to the wish of the County Council they would lose the value as educational experts which they would otherwise have. From time to time subjects would arise of a controversial nature, and the co-opted members would naturally give their votes on the side to which they were partisan. If the members of the committee found that they were outvoted on one of these important controversial questions by the co-opted members, and especially if they were on the committee contrary to the will of the County Council, they would be filled with indignation, and this would cause friction which would materially impair the work. He therefore hoped the Government would see their way to introduce the principle of the County Council having the right to choose what members they should co-opt on these committees.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said that when this question was formerly debated, the Prime Minister stated that it was necessary that these proposals should be put into the scheme, and that the scheme itself should be submitted to the local authority. He certainly expected to see some solution of the question brought before the House to-day by the Government, but apparently that was not to be done. It would have been the simplest matter possible to have inserted words for that purpose in sub-Section (*b*). If that were done he thought it would form a satisfactory solution of the question. He hoped the Prime Minister would re-consider this matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) moved to leave out from "committees" in line 14 to "Provided" in line 16 of Clause 18. He had already stated his views on this Amendment and he did not mean to repeat them. He wished, however, to repeat the question asked by his right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth, namely, what would happen in regard to a scheme to which there was a good deal of objection? Would the incoming Council, after the electorate had been consulted on the subject, have power to present another scheme for the approval of the Board of Education?

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 9, line 14, to leave out the words from the word 'Committees' to the word 'Provided,' in line 16."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 15, stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that this matter was dealt with in Clause 16, sub-Section 3.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said this Amendment was really more or less dealt with in the debate they had just had. He thought the question was admirably met by the Clause referred to by his hon. and learned friend the Attorney General. The sub-Section gave the County Council power to introduce a scheme if new circumstances had arisen rendering it desirable to make a change on the original proposals. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see that it was not necessary to divide the House on this question.

MR. BRYCE said that, although the words were susceptible of the meaning that the County Council might initiate a scheme, they ought to have distinctly implied that the initiation of the scheme lay with the County Council. It should be made perfectly clear that it was open to the County Council to propose a new scheme at any moment. He should have thought that it would have been a great deal better to have postponed the creation of schemes until the new County Councillors were elected and had had plenty of time to consider the question.

(2.0.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 143; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 593.) (2.10.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W, (Derbyshire)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson

Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T r H'ml'ts
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somerset, E
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lloyd-George, David
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Newnes, Sir George
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Allen.

(2.40.) Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 18, page 9, line 19, leave out 'appoint,' and insert 'establish.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the object of his Amendment was to provide in the area of the borough or the urban district that the education committee should infallibly contain a majority of members who were also elected members of the County Council. Under the Bill as it at present stood it was open to Councils for small areas to determine whether or not a majority of their members, or indeed any of its members at all, need be placed on the education committees. He did not suppose any such Council would take such a step, because it would be opposed to all ideas of local government; but he submitted that there could be no reason whatever for giving to Councils not being County

Councils an option of placing or declining to place on the committee a majority of its members. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 18, page 9, line 33, after 'unless,' insert 'in the case of a county.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said there was very great force in the considerations urged by the hon. Member, and he saw no objection on the point of principle to his Amendment. He understood that there was a general desire in boroughs that the principle should obtain that a majority of the committee should be members of the council. That being so he did not see why the House should not pass the Amendment of the hon. Member.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said the effect of the addition of the words he proposed to move would be to prevent the Board of Education, in the last resort, from forcing on to the scheme of an unwilling Council the right of nomination as members of the education committee of persons who were outside that body. The County Councils of England viewed with considerable apprehension the insertion of words in the Bill which would oblige them to take the nominees of other bodies than their own against their will. He believed that the provision, in its present form, would be a source of friction and trouble between the Board of Education and the County Councils. The result would be deplorable, and would not serve the interests either of the Board of Education or the County Councils, the ratepayers or the taxpayers, and it certainly would not serve the interests of education.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 35, to insert, after the word 'desirable,' the words 'to the council.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse*).

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said it was obvious that this Clause of the Bill was framed on the analogy of the Welsh educational bodies, and it was of course the fact that on those bodies there were some persons nominated from outside and not directly by the County Councils. But this could not be taken as a precedent for the proposal now before them. The schemes by which extraneous bodies nominated members to serve on the Welsh county governing bodies were submitted to and approved by the County Councils concerned before passing into law. It was, therefore, completely in the power of the Councils to decide whether those extraneous bodies ought to have an independent right of nomination. Consequently, any external nomination was only made with the full consent of the County Councils themselves.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought the argument of his right hon. friend was founded partly on a misapprehension of the construction of the Clause, and partly on the supposition that the Board of Education, in dealing with this matter, would be as perverse as it was possible for a Government Department to be. The County Councils in framing their schemes might send a list of representatives to the Board of Education, and his right hon. friend seemed to think that the Department would say: "We cannot accept this direct nomination; we must have the nomination of the bodies which we think ought to be represented." It was a very difficult thing to predict what one's course of conduct would be a few months hence, but whether he was at the Board of Education or not, he conceived that the Department would look at the list of representatives, and would, in all probability, say that it adequately supplied the education committee with persons acquainted with the needs of the area. There might be cases in which it was thought that certain bodies or interests were not represented. In those circumstances the Board of Education would represent to the County Councils the importance of appointing representatives of that society or interest. It might be that the association or body itself might appeal to the Board of Education that it should be represented, and it would then be the duty of the Board to bring the claim of this society before the County Council with a view to its being represented either by nomination or by direct representation as the case might be. He could not imagine that friction would arise except in very rare cases where a County Council insisted on ignoring the interest of some educational body or group of schools within its area which had every right to make its voice heard in the education of the district. Under such circumstances the Board of Education would have the right of intervention, and in the interest of education it was desirable that the Board should retain that power. He anticipated that it would be used on the rarest occasions, but its existence would be a safeguard against possible injustice and the ignoring of interests that ought to be considered. He did not agree with his hon. friend that acceptance of a nomination would be a merely mechanical action on the part of a Council. He believed he was right in point of law in saying that when nominations were made by the selected bodies the Council would be able to refuse to appoint the nominees of those bodies. It would only be in the event of a wholly unsuitable person being nominated that an appointment would fail to take place; but that the Council would maintain the right of appointment in its own hands, although outside bodies were invited to nominate, was a matter upon which he entertained no doubt. Under these circumstances, he believed the fears of his right hon. friend were unfounded, and that the power the section would give to the Board of Education was desirable and necessary.

(3.3.) MR. BRYCE said the fact that this was a question of importance was clearly shown by the resolution of the County Councils to which reference had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset. He thought that all Members of the House would agree on three points: first, that the element of educational competence and knowledge of all kinds likely to help the work of the education committees ought to be represented on those committees; secondly, that no one ought to be appointed who was not generally respected, or who would not have the confidence of every member of the committee or of the Council whose functions the committee were to discharge; and, thirdly, that it was very desirable to avoid the introduction of any element out of which strife, controversy, or jealousy was likely to arise. The committee ought, as far as possible, to be the mirror of the Council, a reflection in the second degree of the electors who had elected the Council, *plus* that element of special knowledge which all agreed it was desirable to associate with the members of the Council on the committee. Those three conditions were amply satisfied by leaving the Council to decide how the committee should be composed, and the compulsory power which the Government proposed to reserve to the Board of Education was not required. It would not be necessary for the Board to insist on the inclusion of persons representing University Colleges or great technical institutions, because when such establishments existed within or near the area of a County Council, the desirability of having such representatives had always been regarded. Then there were persons who had given their lives to the study of educational methods, who had considered the relative value of different kinds of study, and were able to judge as to how far scientific ought to be combined with humanistic study, and to determine the point at which general liberal education or general scientific education ought to pass into technical education. But those again were persons whom every Borough or County Council would be glad to appoint. What, then, was the interest it was thought desirable should be represented, but the representation of which it was supposed the County Council might resist? He could only suppose it was that of the denominational associations. Why should they be represented? They would not necessarily bring any kind of educational competence, or represent any interest which ought to be safeguarded, because the question of religious education had already been provided for. If they should happen to represent any special interest or knowledge in particular cases, there was no reason to suppose the Councils would be unwilling to recognise the fact. He felt some difficulty in arguing the question, because the House was still completely in the dark as to who the Government thought would need representation. As to the remarks of the Secretary to the Board of Education, nobody would in the least object to any suggestion on the part of the Board as to the societies or interests to be represented. County or Borough Councils ought to be glad to have such advice, and possibly the Board would be able, by putting it to them as a matter of public duty, to persuade desirable persons to serve who would not otherwise do so. But why should it be supposed that the Council would reject the suggestion of the Board if founded on reason and good sense? The hon. Gentleman went on to say that if the Council persisted in refusing such suggestions, they would have to be compelled to obey the Board of Education. That was the point the Councils resented. They wished to know why on these bodies that were to act for and under them there should be an element in no way amenable to them, but put there as a sentinel to watch them for fear any injustice should be done to a certain kind of school. It was not surprising that the Councils should resent such a suspicion. On the question of nomination, did the hon. Gentleman mean that if an undesirable person were nominated, the Council would have the right to refuse to accept that nominee?

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE asked whether, supposing a diocesan association sent in a nomination which the Council declined to accept, the right of nomination in the particular body would lapse, or would another nominee be submitted? If the latter was the case, perpetual wrangles might ensue between the Council and the association concerned, the latter nominating and the former refusing the nominations. The possibility of such a result could not be viewed with any satisfaction.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he could not anticipate that a County Council and diocesan association would behave in such a perverse and unmanageable way.

Mr. BRYCE hoped such a case would not arise, but there was the possibility of it, and extreme cases were the test of an enactment. The Board of Education clearly apprehended the possibility of such conflicts, or they would not demand this power. Was it not much better to adopt the plain and simple principle of trusting the County Council in the matter? All possibility of friction ought to be avoided. He would go so far as to say that no person to whom the County Council could reasonably object ought to be placed on the committee, as the mere fact that he was objected to would prevent a man being a useful member of the committee. More than that, no body or association ought to have a right of nomination to whom the County Council would not gladly and willingly give such right. He would not repeat the argument of the right hon. Member for East Somerset, but he would put the point that he especially felt, namely, that they ought to endeavour to keep in touch with public opinion as it would be represented by the local authority.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think a good deal of the objection which has been raised with regard to this provision, whether in the Committee stage or the Report stage, arises from the idea that it is the intention of the Board of Education to flood these advisory committees with a large number of persons whose sole, or principal, qualification is that they represented associations of voluntary schools. I do not think that that anticipation is well founded. I would remind the House how great is the transition from our existing system of providing board schools and the method proposed to be brought into existence under this Bill. We must bear in mind that under the system of School Board elections the minority vote prevails; and, though I think it is open to the gravest objection, though personally I have to admit that I have changed my opinion upon it, still it has this advantage—I was going to say this solitary advantage amongst all its disadvantages—that it gives to unpopular minorities in a locality a certitude of representation upon the Board, not only upon the advisory body, but upon the controlling body which actually had the whole of the administration. Now, Sir, the whole of that is swept away absolutely from the controlling body by the plan of this Bill. The controlling body is the County Council or the Borough Council as the case may be, and that is the body really responsible for the whole educational policy of the district, and that is the body with whose constitution we are at this moment concerned. There is no question now of giving minorities, as regards the County Council or the Borough Council, any rights or privileges such as those possessed as regards the School Boards. But I think it is just as well that there should be some provision by which an unpopular minority may have a representative to make its case out on the advisory committee of the governing body. I wish to be quite frank with the House. Of course the body which I have chiefly in mind is the Roman Catholic. At present, as every one knows, in many of the large towns where there is any considerable Roman Catholic population, and, in consequence, a certain number of Roman Catholic voluntary schools, Roman Catholics can always, by organising their forces, obtain one representative or more on the School Board. I think there ought to be some method by which a person representing this rather exceptional educational community might have the advantage of being on the advisory committee. I do not think that the educational value of the advisory committee will in any way be injured by such selection, and I am very sure that the general views of the educational community in those districts will only carry more weight, constituted as I suggest, than if, by some unfortunate accident, any really important and possibly unpopular minority might have no method whatever of constitutionally making its voice heard.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that the Prime Minister had made out a view with which he had very considerable sympathy. If, however, they were to pay attention to that broad view, the words of the Bill were too wide. All the County Councils of England were to be subjected to great inconvenience in order to obviate a danger which might be prevented in some other way. The words as they stood in the Clause, "where it appears desirable," were ambiguous. To whom was it desirable? to the Council? to the Board of Education? or to the nominating bodies? In order to avoid friction, he thought it ought to be, "to the County Council." Even if the words of the Amendment were inserted, it would still be competent for the Board of Education to overrule the County Council, because any scheme framed had to be submitted to the Board of Education for their approval. It would be far better that the Board of Education should exercise its functions in a friendly way than that they should adopt an attitude of command. He ventured to assert that the County Councils would never disregard the friendly representations of the Board of Education as to the equitable representation on the education committees of particular interests, and he strongly urged the Government to accept the Amendment so as to place the County Councils in their proper position. He ventured to doubt the Secretary to the Board of Education's dictum, that according to the wording of the Clause the County Council could refuse to elect a person nominated under a scheme, and he therefore urged that the Government should make the point quite clear by accepting the Amendment.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY said it was perfectly true that the cumulative vote had secured the representation of Roman Catholics on many of our large School Boards. If the services of persons in Holy Orders, ministers belonging to dissenting denominations, and Catholic priests were to be secured in the future as in the past, it must be done by some such method as the Government now proposed. On the School Boards the elections had been bitterly fought time and again in the past, in order to secure the presence on the body of certain Dissenting ministers, certain members of the Church of England, and certain Catholic priests. Therefore he hoped this system would be maintained. If they carried the Amendment which had been proposed, those services would be lost. Realising that under the Municipal Corporations Act these persons would be disfranchised, and because he believed that popular opinion was in favour of securing representation by this means, he should support the proposal of the Government.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that the action of the Government in this matter did mitigate the severity of some of the earlier portions of the Clause. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for adhering to his position.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster) expressed the hope that it would be made clear that, as the Secretary to the Board of Education had said, the County Councils had the power of appointment of outside members of the education committee, because in many cases they would be the best judges of the individuals who should be elected. He did not think the words of the Clause were at all clear, or left the County Councils freedom of action.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON replied that he thought the words were perfectly clear. The County Councils could appoint by direct nomination, and not necessarily by nomination of other bodies.

*SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON, (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said that he wished to say one word in the interests of the ratepayers. He pointed out that the County Councils could only act through their education committee, because all matters were by the Clause to stand referred to the education committee. It would be necessarily the case that in large counties the Councils would be composed of exceedingly busy men who could not devote their whole time to public work and would be obliged to leave the educational work to the education committee. But how did they propose to treat the County Councils in the matter of control? To begin with, the urban districts who will have their own educational scheme send representatives to the County Council. They would be allowed to vote for the election of the education committee; that seemed to the county ratepayers to be unfair. The county councillors for the urban districts and their constitutents did not pay the rate, and yet they had the power of influencing the election of the committee. They might on occasion turn the scale in such an election. Now they were told, in addition to having men upon the education committee who did not pay the rate, they were to have members added by the Board of Education on the nomination of outside bodies. These added members might be faddists who only wished to carry out their fads regardless of expense, and yet the County Council were not to have the power of refusing them. Any county councillor seeking election and blamed for extravagance on the part of the County Council, could reply, "It is not our fault, it is the fault of the urban district representatives, and of the nominated members forced on us." He believed the County Council should have full responsibility.

(3.36.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 81; Noes, 155. (Division List No. 594.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G Ellison
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rankin, Sir James
Rigg, Richard
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J. A. (Gl'morg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene

Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Henry Hobhouse and
Sir John Dorington.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hon J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw H
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hon. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said the principle of the Amendment which he had to move was to insist upon it that a man should not have a direct vote on any question which related to the amount of his salary or to the conditions of his employment. The Amendment was as much in the interest of the teaching staff as it was in that of the public generally.

*MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Montgomery move his first Amendment?

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: Yes, I move the first Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 6, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'unless the council otherwise determine.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

(3.50.) MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE thought that the answer which would be given would be to the effect that the financial control was vested in the Council. Any one who had worked on these bodies knew well that many of the financial proposals were practically determined in the education committees themselves. If the committee sanctioned a school or raised a salary and had perhaps some 600 schools to deal with, that action was not very likely to be altered by the Council. That being so, surely it was against all the rules of local government that persons who had a personal interest in these questions should exercise a vote on the subject. He believed that this proposal was against the spirit of the Municipal Corporations Act, and unless corrected in some such way as was proposed it might give rise to very serious complaints.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOTERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said that the Government had some doubt as to what the precise effect of the Amendment would be. If the result would be to give the local authority power to make a general discrimination in regard to the members of the committee the Government would regard the first Amendment with favour; but if the Amendment could be interpreted as enabling the Council to discriminate between individuals, then obviously it was a power which the Government could not allow. There was a general power which prevented those who were personally interested in the result of a decision of the Council from taking part in those decisions, and he suggested that, as there was some doubt as to the precise application of the words, the point should be reserved for another place.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said that at an earlier stage an Amendment was brought up by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Tewkesbury Division of Gloucestershire to exclude all persons having an interest in the work. That Amendment was, with the consent of the Committee, amended on the Motion of the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs, and the Committee distinctly set up an exception, namely, that teachers in schools aided, provided, or maintained by the local authority should not be disqualified from holding seats upon the committees. What did the Amendment now before the House propose? If the local County Council passed a resolution that it would not have any of these persons sitting on the committee, then the work done in Committee of the whole House would be entirely overruled at the will of the County Council. They would thus have the grotesque anomaly of the County Councils taking a different view of the question; one body disqualifying those receiving the smallest amount of pecuniary aid, and a neighbouring body refraining from passing such a resolution. Inasmuch as the speech of the mover of this Amendment was not directed to this Amendment but to another proposal on the Paper, he thought the answer of the President of the Local Government Board had not been very carefully thought out.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was very glad that the Government would not accept the Amendment. It was really directed against the elementary school teachers. If the Amendment were adopted the effect would be that a County Council could pass a resolution excluding every elementary teacher from being appointed.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said that after the statement made by the President of the Local Government Board in regard to the disqualification from voting, he might be allowed to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 8, at end, to insert the words 'but no such person shall vote on any question relating to the salary or conditions of employment of any member of the teaching staff in any school aided, provided, or maintained by the local education authority.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. WALTER LONG said the object of the Amendment was one in regard to which they were all agreed, namely, that members of a body who were deriving immediate benefit from the decisions of that body should not participate in those decisions. It might, however, be found extremely difficult to apply the Amendment if adopted in the form in which it was drawn. The words "or conditions of employment of any member of the teaching staff" were extremely wide, and might preclude a member of the committee from taking part in deliberations in regard to which he might be one of the most competent to speak. Words ought to be introduced which would make the limitation applicable only to the precise point which he had already laid down—that was to say, voting upon a question of salary or questions closely appertaining to salary. That Amendment should not be made hurriedly, as would be the case here.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment in this form. There was a good deal to be said for the view that a member should not be allowed to vote in respect of his own salary, but the words of the Amendment were very sweeping. He suggested that his hon. friend should accept the proposal made by the President of the Local Government Board.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said there ought to be no exception in favour of one class or another. If words were introduced they should include all or none.

MR. ERNEST GRAY suggested that the Amendment should be restricted to the refusal to allow a person to vote upon a question in which he was personally interested.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said that after what the President of the Local Government Board had said he was willing to withdraw the Amendment, but he must point out, in view of the matter being dealt with in another place, that class interests as well as personal interests required to be guarded against.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. YOXALL moved to insert at the beginning of line 12, Clause 18, "Provided that the proper co-ordination of all forms of education under Parts II. and III. of this Act is adequately secured." He hoped the Government would be able to accept the Amendment, because it was intended to secure that there should be due co-ordination of secondary and elementary education.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 12, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Provided that the proper co-ordination of all forms of education under Parts II. and III. of this Act is adequately secured.'"—(*Mr Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

* SIR WILLIAM ANSON said an Amendment which stood in his name on the Paper two lines lower down, expressed what the Government were prepared to do in the matter of the co-ordination of the various forms of education.

MR. YOXALL begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

* SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to leave out "selected and" in line 17, Clause 18.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Otley) moved to add at the end of sub-Section (4)—"Provided that no scheme made by the Board of Education shall provide for the constitution of a separate education committee for any area within the county, or for a joint committee as aforesaid, unless with the consent of the County Council." The intention of the Bill was that the County Council should be supreme within its area, and the Amendment was by way of guarantee that this intention should be carried into effect.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 19, at the end of sub-Section (4), to insert the words 'Provided that no scheme made by the Board of Education shall provide for the constitution of a separate education committee for any area within the county, or for a Joint Committee as aforesaid, unless with the consent of the County Council.'"—(*Mr. Duncan.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE thought it most unlikely that the case contemplated by the Amendment would ever happen. He thought the odds against it were very great indeed, but it was just conceivable that it might, and it seemed undesirable to tie the hands of the Board of Education in the matter.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) hoped the Board of Education would not make any separate districts in a county, because that would greatly harm the administration of the Act. Those arrangements were very much better if they were elastic, and to bring an arrangement of this sort into a scheme would be to introduce a feature of rigidity which he was sure would be mischievous in time to come. He should like the Government to accept the Amendment, but if they could not, he hoped they would give the House an assurance that the Board of Education would not compel an unwilling, or indeed any, County Council to introduce this system.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE hoped the Government would see their way to accept this or a similar Amendment.

MR. BRYCE thought it would be useful to create separate committees for separate areas. It was only in that way that the amount of work involved could be overtaken. But he recognised that it was undesirable to appoint such separate committees without the consent of the County Council, and he, therefore, supported the Amendment.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said there was great doubt as to whether it was desirable to limit the powers of the Board of Education in this matter. He pointed out that schemes were not made by the Board of Education. They were made by the County Councils and approved by the Board of Education. If this Amendment were carried, it would prevent the Board of Education approving a scheme submitted to them by a County Council. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] He hoped the House would not add the proposed proviso to the Clause. It would be inoperative, or, if operative, it might operate mischievously.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to insert at the end of sub-Section (5)—"and before approving any scheme which provides for the appointment of more than one Education Committee shall satisfy themselves that due regard is paid to the importance of the general co-ordination of all forms of education." He said this Amendment was introduced in pursuance of the result of the discussion which took place some time ago, at the instance of the hon. Member for West Nottingham. What was proposed by the Amendment was, he thought, the best way in which to attain the object desired by hon. Members on both sides of the House. That object was to instruct the Board of Education in considering a scheme to take into account the risk of interfering with the co-ordination of different kinds of education by the creation of separate committees for elementary and secondary education.

MR. YOXALL said the Government had recognised in a full and ample manner what he proposed. This instruction to the Board of Education would suffice to prevent any undue frittering away of that management which was so important in the working of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved the omission of sub-Section (*b*), as a protest against acting by Provisional Orders, which gave power to the Government to override the deliberate decisions of the County Councils. There had been several discussions in Committee, in the course of which questions were put to the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education as to what the Government intended to do. The hon. Baronet said that the Board would at first put their views in the form of friendly suggestions, but what would happen if the County Councils declined to accept them? He should like to ask the hon. Baronet now whether it was the intention of the Board of Education to coerce County Councils by forcing upon them the representatives of bodies they did not wish to be represented, or would they leave the ultimate word in these matters with the County Councils which were responsible for education in their districts.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 24, to leave out sub-Section (*b*) of Clause 18."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that he could only repeat now what he had said before, that in his view it would be the duty of the Board of Education to proceed in these matters by suggestion rather than by compulsion. He thought that such a compulsory power as the sub-Section provided ought to be vested in the Board of Education, to be exercised in the last resort, but he could hardly contemplate circumstances arising in which it would be necessary to use it.

MR. BRYCE said that, in any event, procedure by Provisional Order was a most unsatisfactory way of settling questions. A Provisional Order would be carried by a Party majority, because the Board of Education which had framed the scheme would rely on the Party majority to carry it.

(4.28.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 595.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Auston, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit. William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'd
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rx
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H (Som'rset, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)

Mr. Lloyd-George.

Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J. A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

It being after half-past Four of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 11th instant, proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments proposed by the Government to the remaining portions of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 8, after 'fit' insert '(after giving reasonable notice to the overseers of the parish or parishes concerned).'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 21, after 'expenditure,' insert 'or rent.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 28, after 'loans' insert 'or rent.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 19, page 11, line 33, leave out 'the annual,' and insert 'any.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 20, page 12, line 16, after 'a,' insert 'county borough.'"

"In Clause 20, page 12, line 25, after 'county borough,' insert 'borough.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 33, to leave out the words 'control or.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(4.40.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 596.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Price and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick, N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 22, page 13, line 19, leave out 'as a,' and insert 'and having the same effect as an original.'"

"In Clause 22, page 13, lines 19 and 20, leave out 'for establishing an Education Committee under this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 13, line 25, to leave out the word 'elementary,' and insert the words 'instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as prescribed by regulations to be made by the Board of Education for the purpose.'"—*Sir William Anson.*)

(4.50.) Question put, "That the word 'elementary' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 77; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 597.)

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Roland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmund
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W,
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfel, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Words inserted in the Bill.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 23, page 13, line 33, at end, add, 'Provided that the local education authority may with the consent of the Board of Education extend those limits in the case of any such school if no suitable higher education is available within a reasonable distance of the school.'"

"In Clause 23, page 13, line 33, add as a new sub-Section, '(3) The power to supply or aid the supply of education other than elementary includes a power to train teachers, and to supply or aid the supply of any education except where that education is given at a public elementary day school or at evening schools which are elementary schools.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 23, page 14, line 2, after 'appointment,' insert 'of managers.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 14, line 13, at the end, to insert, as a new sub-Section the words, '(8) In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'trust deed' includes any instrument regulating the trusts or management of a school.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(5.1.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 164; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 598.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell, W. J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph Barnsley
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 23, page 14, line 25, leave out 'act or.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 23, page 14, lines 26 and 27, leave out 'as regards,' and insert 'which relates only to.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 23, page 14, line 32, at end, add as a new sub-Section—'(12) The Board of Education may, if they think fit, hold a public inquiry for the purpose of the exercise of any of their powers or the performance of any of their duties under this Act, and section seventy-three of The Elementary Education Act, 1870, shall apply to any public inquiry so held, or held under any other provision of this Act.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 14, line 34, after 'relating to,' insert 'education committees and managers, and to.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 14, line 38, leave out 'to any area for which Part III. of this Act is adopted,' and insert, 'and other enactments referred to in that schedule.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 24, page 15, line 1, leave out all after 'schedule,' to end of Clause."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 26, page 15, line 13, leave out 'twelve' and insert 'eighteen.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 26, page 15, line 16, leave out 'local education authorities' and insert 'councils.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 16, line 27, after the word 'Chairman,' to insert the words 'except in cases where there is an *ex-officio* Chairman.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(5.13.) Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 599.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somerset, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O‘Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor,Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorg'n,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 1, page 16, line 35, after 'Chairman' insert 'of the meeting.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 18, line 13, leave out 'that fund' and insert 'the proper fund or account.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 18, line 39, at end, insert, as a fresh paragraph—(9) The disqualification of any persons who are, at the time of the passing of this Act, members of any Council and who will become disqualified for office in consequence of this Act shall not, if the Council so resolve, take effect until a day fixed by the Resolution, not being later than the next ordinary day of retirement of councillors in the case of a County Council, the next ordinary day of election of councillors in the case of the Council of a borough, and the 15th day of April in the year 1904 in the case of an Urban District Council."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 2, page 20, line 27, at end, add 'and if any compensation is payable otherwise than by way of an annual sum, the payment of that compensation shall be a purpose for which a Council may borrow for the purposes of this Act."

MR. BRYCE: Is this Amendment in order, as it may possibly affect the incidence of taxation?

*MR. SPEAKER: It appears to be in order, as it only affects the method of raising money.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 3, page 20, line 35, after 'act,' insert 'except as respects transactions before the appointed day and.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 3, page 21, line 33, after 'shall,' insert 'unless the context otherwise requires.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out the word 'section,' and insert the words 'sections fifteen and.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

(5.26.) Question put, "That the word 'section' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 600.)

AYES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, RtHn. C. R. (Northants
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Price and Mr. Soames.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Campbell, RtHon J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJ. A. (Worc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hon Sir J (Manc'r.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, RtHnH (Somerset, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Doherty, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Words inserted in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 22, line 17, insert 'sections fifteen and.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 22, line 30, after 'fifty-one,' insert 'in section fifty-two in the words "under the provisions of this Act with respect to the appointment of a body of managers."'"

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 4, page 23, leave out lines 11, 12, and 13."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 1*st December*, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off from the total amount of notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next.—(*The Lord Balfour.*) (No. 190.)

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

SCHOOL TEACHING OF COLONIAL HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY — PROPOSED "EMPIRE DAY."

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, I rise to ask the President of the Board of Education whether in the schools connected with his Department he will lay greater stress than at present on the teaching of the history and geography of the Colonies and Dependencies of the Empire; and whether he will suggest to the school authorities that the 24th May in each year, being the anniversary of the birth of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, might very appropriately be called "Empire Day," and be kept as a half-holiday by the scholars attending State-aided schools, and that the remainder of the day might be spent by them in exercises of a patriotic character, and in pleasant instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its responsibilities. On Thursday next your Lordships will be engaged in discussing a Bill of first-class importance dealing with the subject of education. The questions I have just asked are also connected with that subject, but they are probably not questions which will excite very great interest outside this House, nor are they likely to lead to controversy. But, at the same time, though they are very small reforms in the practical working of education, I venture to think that, if carried out, they may have a greater and more far-reaching influence over the destinies of the Empire than would appear at first sight. I think it is difficult to exaggerate the importance to a citizen of the British Empire of a thorough knowledge of the history and geography, not only of this country but of those Colonies and Dependencies which are under the rule of our Gracious Sovereign. And when I say history and geography, I mean, as regards the latter, not only a knowledge of the capes and bays, rivers and mountains, and the towns of the countries in question, but also some knowledge of their agricultural, mineral, and botanical resources, and of the men and women who inhabit them.

Why do I lay such great stress upon the teaching of the history and geography of the Empire as a whole? Because it is very difficult to realise the vast responsibilities which lie upon the people of this country. There is no other nation in the world which has such a vast dependent population. What do I mean by that? I mean that there is no other nation which has such a large number of subjects who have no voice in the ruling of their destinies. Our Gracious Sovereign, as a Constitutional Monarch, rules, through Parliament, over an Empire which is situated in all five continents of the world, whose extent is spread over 12 million square miles, and whose population consists of 400 millions. It is very difficult to realise what is meant by 400 millions. Perhaps the easiest way of bringing it to our minds is to say that, roughly speaking, the population of these islands is 40 millions, and that the population of the British Empire is ten times as great. Now out of these 400 millions there are only 50 millions who can be said to be self-governing, forty millions inside these islands and ten millions outside. Consequently there are 350 million people dependent upon the goodwill of Parliament, and Parliament is elected—who by?—by the

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

men who have been educated in our State-aided schools. They are in the majority. They have it in their power either to govern this Empire well or ill, and to bring either happiness or misery to these 350 million people who are dependent upon their voice; and unless they are educated so as to know something about these people, where they live, and their customs and habits, how possibly can they influence Parliament to govern righteously and properly?

I freely acknowledge that since I brought this subject before your Lordships some years ago a vast improvement has been effected by the Education Department in this particular branch of education, but, although much has been done, I am very firmly of opinion that a great deal more can be done in the way of reform. What does the ordinary elector know of the past history, experiences, customs, and habits of thought of the people over whom we rule? What knowledge has he generally of the vast populations that inhabit the British Empire? I fear his knowledge is very limited. When I first brought this subject to the notice of your Lordships, matters were certainly very much worse than they are now. At that time there was practically nothing taught as regards the Empire as a whole. I will tell your Lordships a story which will illustrate to a certain degree my meaning. I was invited some years ago to give an address to some young lads, many of whom had just left school, the others being in the higher standards of the school. After thinking over the matter, I decided to try and interest them in the subject of heroism, and I selected for my subject, "How the Victoria Cross was gained in the Indian Mutiny by some of our most distinguished officers." As soon as I began my address I noted that there was a distinct lack of intelligence in the eyes of those I was addressing, and I at once saw that I was out of touch with them. I thought that the words "Indian Mutiny" were evidently strange to them, and I substituted "Sepoy Mutiny," but there was still no sign of intelligence. I then thought I would try and put it in a roundabout way, and I referred to it as "the great war, which all of you must have heard of, in which we retained, with the utmost difficulty, our Indian Empire." There was absolutely no response. Feeling very uncomfortable, I said I should be very much obliged if those lads who had heard of a war in India, or of a Sepoy war, or of an Indian Mutiny would hold up their hands, but only one hand was held up. I could not understand it, and after I had concluded my address I went to the schoolmaster of the village — it is a village within twenty-five miles of London—and I said:

"Do you mean to say you have never taught your boys anything about the Indian Mutiny?"

His reply was:

"No, my Lord, how could I? You would not have been able to do it either. These boys leave at 13 years of age. I am bound by the Education Department to teach them from the very beginning, the Saxon period and the Roman period, and the majority of my boys never get further than the Tudors. There are a few who go as far as the Stuarts, but there is not one boy who has heard of the Hanoverian period."

What must be the condition of mind of a boy leaving school and imagining that Queen Elizabeth was the predecessor of Queen Victoria? True, that is not the state of things now, for an improvement has been made since I last spoke in the House on the subject. I said then that the proper way to teach history was to teach it backwards. The events of the Hanoverian period, when the liberties of the country were on the anvil; the great struggle which occurred between what are now the United States and this country; all the progress of thought which led up to the French Revolution, and which we are still feeling the effects of; the gigantic struggle with Napoleon—these and other comparatively modern events were at that time a blank to the great majority of those who were taught in the State-aided schools. It is not so bad now, but still I believe that if you were to go down to your schools, you would be very much astonished to find how few scholars there are who have any real knowledge of events of comparatively modern times.

Having once launched into this question I looked still further, and found that at that time it was impossible for girls to learn needlework, history, and geography, and that, because these three subjects were class subjects they were only able to take up two. There are now no longer any class subjects, and the block system has worked infinitely better. At the time of which I speak I engaged a schoolmistress to teach one of my infant children, and I found she did not know that Australia was British. At the same time I found that all the boys knew that Alfred the Great had received a cuff because he did not properly carry out some culinary process. Incidents such as these had been taught them with great trouble, but of what value to them in after life such knowledge can be thought to be I cannot imagine. I am thankful to see that amongst the compulsory subjects which are at present enforced are included needlework, science, geography, and history; but there is one that I am not thankful for—namely, grammar. I am also not thankful to find that a certain paragraph which was put into the Education Code after my speech in this House has been omitted. The paragraph I refer to is as follows:—

> "Inspectors, in the examination of the Fourth and higher Standards in elementary schools, will call the attention of the scholars to our distant possessions, their productions, government, and resources, and to those climatic and other conditions which render them suitable fields for emigration and honourable enterprise."

Why it has been left out I do not know. It is certainly a retrograde step, and I trust that some similar paragraph may be reinserted. It is to me a matter of vital national consequence that all who dwell beneath the protecting influence of the Union Jack should have some correct understanding of the history, extent, power, and resources of the great Empire to which they belong, and some idea of the operative forces, geographical, social, and political, which have been at work in constructing this vast and prosperous State.

How much time is devoted in our schools to history at this moment? One hour a week only. The other half hour, which I suppose the Department would say is devoted to history, is really devoted to reading, for the whole of the attention of both master and scholar is directed to how the latter reads and not to the subject of history. Consequently I assert that there is only one hour a week devoted to history. The same amount of time is devoted to geography. As regards geography, I have here the Education Code. Nine model or specimen schemes of instruction for the guidance of masters are given in the Code, but of these there are only four which, under the heading of geography, mention the Colonies at all; and there is not a single mention anywhere under the heading of history of the Colonies or of the Empire. It may be that this knowledge is imparted, for reference is made in the schemes to Historical Readers. I have no doubt that some of these Historical Readers do refer to Imperial matters, but what I want to ask the President of the Board of Education to do is this. I want him not to leave it to the discretion of teachers as to whether they will or will not teach subjects connected with the Empire, but to say that he desires, as the representative of the Government, that the citizens of this country should know something about the British dominions beyond these islands. That is what I hope may be the result of this discussion this afternoon. Another question to which I should like particularly to draw the attention of the President of the Board of Education, is that of the maps which are hung up on the walls of schools, many of which are so ancient that they are absolutely useless. What are known as the Howard Vincent and the Navy League maps are excellent ones, giving the latest information, and I hope that, wherever it is possible the noble Marquess will use his influence to see that these or equally up-to-date maps are procured, for it appears to me to be very much more important that a British subject should be acquainted with the British Empire than that he should be an expert in all the geographical details of Germany or France.

One of the objections that will be raised to my remarks will be this. It will be said that there is so much already to be done in the schools that it is quite impossible to do anything more. I quite acknowledge that there is a great deal to be done, and that it is most difficult to impart all the necessary knowledge to boys and girls who leave at the early age of thirteen. But I have a suggestion to make on the subject. Can any one tell me that the study of grammar has ever really benefited those of the poorer classes who have gone through these schools? Personally, I have never yet met one who has been the better for all the hours spent on grammar. No doubt, after leaving school, a bright lad will teach himself to write and speak correctly, but my assertion is that the great mass of the younger children spend hours on grammar which might be spent on more useful subjects, and that they go out of the school to their homes, and talk and write just as incorrectly as before. If I am right, then grammar should be taught only in the higher classes, and more practical subjects substituted in the case of the young.

My second question, in regard to Empire Day, is one upon which I lay great stress. My proposal is that a day be established throughout the entire Empire on which the attention of all children attending State-aided schools should be specially directed to matters appertaining to the Empire and its responsibilities. Such a movement would be calculated to hasten the time when the whole Empire would be more closely bound together than at present. The children, moreover, would obtain a knowledge which would enable them to receive the advantage of closer federation, and would promote an affectionate regard for their fellow-subjects in other portions of the Empire. I have suggested May 24th as the most suitable day. I do not say that it is the only day, but it is the day which, I think, has commended itself to most people. We know how the Empire has expanded during the reign of our late gracious Sovereign. We know the interest she took in the Empire and its growth; and I do not think there could be a more appropriate day than the anniversary of the birth of the late Queen Victoria. This idea is no new or untried one. Empire Day in its full significance—that is to say, a day on which for several hours the children's attention should be drawn to matters of Empire, and for the rest they should be allowed to amuse themselves—is already in operation in four Colonies in different parts of the world, viz., in Nova Scotia, in Ontario, in Manitoba, and in Natal. In addition to the full Empire Day being in operation in these four Colonies, and also, I believe, in Cape Colony, May 24th is kept already as a holiday in a large number of other Colonies. It is established by law as a legal holiday throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada, in the West Indies, Barbadoes, Jamaica, and in the Straits Settlements. In India it has been gazetted as a holiday under the title of Empress Day. Therefore May 24th is already kept as a special holiday throughout the greater part of the British Empire, and the special instruction which I suggest should be given on that day in this country has been given in the schools in many of our Colonies. The Colonial Secretary, to whose attention I brought this subject before he left for South Africa, was kind enough to express sympathy with the idea, but said, very naturally, that he did not see his way to recommend the proposal to the Colonies or Dependencies until it had been adopted at home. He, however, gave me to understand that if the holiday were established at home, he would be happy to do his best to recommend it to the Colonies. At the Colonial Secretary's suggestion, I have corresponded on the subject with the different statesmen and representatives of the Empire who visited this country at the time of the Coronation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier writes to the effect that they had already established May 24th as a legal holiday throughout the whole of Canada. The Prime Minister of Ontario writes—

> "The matter is one of great importance to the future of the Empire, and I am delighted to see that your Lordship is taking it up."

The Prime Minister of British Columbia states—

> "The sentiment is unanimous here in favour of an Empire Day."

The Agent General for New Brunswick writes—

> "I am entirely in sympathy with your object."

The Prime Minister of New Zealand, in his reply to me, writes—

> "I need hardly say that I am strongly of opinion that the establishment of such a day would be fraught with much good to the Empire."

The Postmaster-General of Canada writes—

> "The object meets with my most cordial approval."

The Prime Minister of Newfoundland writes—

> "I am entirely in accord with your views, and shall have much pleasure in aiding the movement."

Lord Milner says—

> "Your proposal to establish an Empire Day is one which has my sympathy."

Lord Grenfell, the Governor of British Honduras, the Governor of Jamaica, and the Governor of Mauritius write very much in the same way, and I have also received letters from a number of Indian princes expressing approval of the proposal. After this unanimous expression, I shall indeed be disappointed if His Majesty's Government do not seize this splendid opportunity of taking the lead in a movement which, in future years, will be regarded as having exercised no inconsiderable influence on the strengthening and consolidation of the British Empire.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, I trust my noble friend will not censure me when I say that I do not think it is possible for me to follow him over the whole of the ground covered in his interesting speech. I shall confine myself to briefly answering the Questions put to me by the noble Earl. Although I fear that my answer will not be thoroughly satisfactory to my noble friend, still in the object which he has in view he has my entire sympathy. In the first place, my noble friend asks me whether in the schools connected with my Department, I will lay greater stress than at present on the teaching of the history and geography of the Colonies and Dependencies of the Empire. In reply to that question, I have to say that history and geography naturally occupy a very important place in the Code; but it would be with great hesitation and reluctance that I would propose at the present moment to add to that Code by insisting on the teaching of certain details of history and geography in the elementary schools. But the Colonies are not lost sight of in the Code. My noble friend will see that the instruction to be given to the pupil teachers includes the subjects of Africa, America and Australia, with special reference to the chief British Colonies and Dependencies and the United States.

THE EARL OF MEATH: That applies to pupil teachers.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: That is so. I merely mentioned it to show that the matter was not lost sight of. But I do not see why the Code might not be to a certain extent enlarged in the direction which the noble Earl indicated, and there is one very attractive way in which these questions might be brought to the attention of the children of this country. Your Lordships, no doubt, have in your mind the tour accomplished recently by the Prince and Princess of Wales, and it may be that some of your Lordships have read the elaborate work describing the tour written by Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace. It is, to my mind, an interesting, instructive, and attractive work, and I am informed that it will shortly be condensed and published in a cheaper form. I would be glad to see the managers of schools take advantage of that work in their schools, and, in doing so, they would receive every encouragement at my hands. Communications are now taking place between the Board of Education and the Colonial Office with regard to extending a knowledge of the Colonies among children in England, and a knowledge of England among the children of the Colonies, and a Committee has been formed to carry Mr. Chamberlain's proposal into effect. On that Committee there will be a representative of the Board of Education.

The noble Earl next asked whether I would suggest to the school authorities that May 24th in each year, being the anniversary of the birth of Her late Majesty, Queen Victoria, might very appropriately be called "Empire day," and be kept as a half-holiday by the scholars attending State-aided schools, and that the remainder of the day might be spent by them in exercises of a patriotic character, and in pleasant instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its responsibilities. This part of the question also has my entire sympathy, but my noble friend must go to an authority far greater and more influential than I am for the carrying out of his suggestion for an "Empire day." With regard to observing such a day as a half-holiday, I should be very unwilling to move in such a matter and interfere with the managers of the schools in reference to school attendance. The time, I hope, is not far distant when the local authorities will be associated with these managers, and I am most anxious that when that day comes the local authorities should co-operate cordially with the Board of Education. I cannot help thinking that those bodies in the future, and the managers at present, would look askance at the President of the Board of Education if they thought he was taking matters which were really in their prerogative out of their hands. I will, however, again assure my noble friend of my entire sympathy, and, if it is possible to carry out his suggestions, he will find in the Board of Education the most hearty co-operation.

PRIVILEGE—THE LORDS AND MONEY BILLS—THE FINANCIAL CLAUSES OF THE EDUCATION BILL.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the debate on the Committee stage of the Voluntary Schools Bill on the 2nd April, 1897; and to ask His Majesty's Government whether they intend to adhere to the views laid down by the Lord Chancellor, and adopted by the House on his advice, with regard to its procedure on the forthcoming Committee on the Education Bill of this year. I am taking this somewhat novel course for the convenience of debate in the different stages of the Education Bill, and especially in the Committee stage, which will be taken next week. This Question raises the very important question of the privileges of the two Houses of Parliament. I believe that it is undisputed that this House can throw out a financial Bill and even throw out a Clause of the Bill as long as that Clause is a separate issue from the rest of the Bill. I am not going to try to minimise the privileges of the other House; all I wish is to be quite clear as to what comes within the question of privilege and what does not. The Resolution of the other House which now regulates this matter was passed in 1671, and is as follows—

> "That in all aids given to the King by the Commons the rate or tax ought not to be altered by the Lords,"

and there is a second Resolution dated July 3rd, 1678, which declares—

> "That all aids and supplies to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."†

That Resolution is a very sweeping one, and it has been applied in a very sweeping way by the greatest legal authority in this House, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I should also like to quote the opinion of the late Prime Minister and Leader of the House. The noble Marquess has on several occasions spoken on the subject, but not always, I think, distinctly and clearly. In 1891, on an occasion to which I will presently refer, Lord Salisbury said—

> "I think, in assenting to the Amendment we ought to indicate that, though we do so for the sake of the Bill being passed, we cannot consent to the doctrine stated in the reasons sent up by the House of Commons being made a precedent hereafter, that anything which may indirectly lead to an increase in the public charge is outside the competence of this House."

That is a very strong opinion. In 1896 the noble Marquess said, on the Second Reading of the Agricultural Rating Bill, that—

> "We cannot, according to our ordinary practice, when we get into Committee, alter the details of the Bill, and therefore comments on the mere Committee part of the measure are not very relevant to the issue which is now before us. No one can say that this Bill has been insufficiently discussed in the other House of Parliament."

I take the following from the same debate—

> "The EARL of ROSEBERY: It is a little difficult to tell where to take the noble Marquess with regard to the Bill. He has told us, though not in very clear terms, that we are not exactly competent to discuss so financial a Bill.
>
> "The MARQUESS of SALISBURY: I never said that.
>
> "The EARL of ROSEBERY: Will the noble Marquess state again what his doctrine is?
>
> "The MARQUESS of SALISBURY: My doctrine is that we are perfectly competent to do what he proposes, namely, to throw out the Second Reading, but according to the practice of Parliament—I do not say we are intrinsically incompetent to do it—it would be a grave departure from ancient practice if we altered the Bill in Committee."

That is not a perfectly clear statement, for the noble Marques sadmitted that we were not intrinsically incompetent to do it, and yet said it would be a grave departure from ancient practice if we altered the Bill in Committee.

---

† The first of these Resolutions gave rise to fierce controversy between the two Houses. Several Conferences were held, and the precedents, back to the time of the first Edward, were examined. (See *Parliamentary History*, IV., 480). The Lords Journals during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contain a number of "Protests" of great interest in connection with this subject.—[ED.]

I wish to refer to the interpretation which has on different occasions been put on the Resolution to which I referred in the beginning of my speech. First of all I will take the great Education Measure of 1870, which provided grants out of the Exchequer in aid of education. When that Bill came to this House the Earl of Powis moved an Amendment in Clause 94 to the effect that the proceedings should be carried on by a teacher certificated by the Education Department. That was allowed to be put but was not carried, and Lord Salisbury then moved to add at the end of Clause 94 the words:—

> "Provided that no conditions shall be required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual Parliamentary grant by any Minutes of the Education Department not in force at the time of the passing of this Act, unless such Minutes shall have been laid for six weeks upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament and shall not have been objected to in an Address to Her Majesty from either House."

This Amendment was carried. Therefore I think it is clearly shown that Amendments which might almost come under the term "conditions" were permitted in the Bill of 1870 to be moved in this House. To the Elementary Education Bill of 1891 over twenty Amendments were moved by noble Lords. One remarkable Amendment, which was carried, went down to the House of Commons, where attention was drawn by, I think, Sir Henry Fowler, to the fact that its effect would be to increase the rate or charge under a section of the Bill. The Speaker gave his opinion that the Amendment was against the privileges of the House of Commons, and the Government of the day having taken time to consider it, Lord Cranbrook, who was Lord President of the Council at the time, said that he did not agree with the decision of the Speaker, but as it was important that the Bill should pass he would modify the Amendment so as to stipulate that no increase of rate could be made. The amended Amendment was then agreed to. Lord Salisbury, although he concurred on that occasion in the change, thought it necessary afterwards to move the following Resolution, which was carried:—

> "That this House, in agreeing to the said Amendment, makes no admission in respect of any deduction which may be made from the reasons offered by the House of Commons, and does not consent that the said reasons should hereafter be drawn into a precedent."

The Voluntary Schools Bill of 1897 was not solely a money Bill, for it raised the whole question of the settlement of 1870, but it did deal with money payments. When the Bill came before your Lordships I moved the first Amendment, to provide for a representative of the local authority, or the parents, on the management.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): The noble Earl ought to read the first words of the Clause he then proposed to amend. That Clause dealt with grants that were to be paid.

*EARL SPENCER: I agree that it was one of the provisions that grants should be given. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack gave his opinion that the Amendment came within privilege, and therefore I did not press it. Several considerable Amendments which came in the same category were ruled out. I admit that they depended on grants, but at the same time they would have had a general effect on the management, just as would be the case with some of the Amendments we would like to make in the Bill of this year. I wish to know what the Government intend to do with regard to that Bill, as there are a great many points on which we should like to move Amendments, and the Episcopal Bench would doubtless desire also to move Amendments. Does the noble and learned Lord intend to adopt the same procedure that he adopted in 1897? I do not wish in the slightest degree to diminish the privileges of the other House, but I desire a clear and distinct statement as to the intentions of the Government and learned Lord on the Woolsack.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, no one will complain that the noble Earl has raised this question in a preliminary manner. As far as I am able to answer the noble Earl, I will tell him frankly what my view is. On the occasion last referred to nothing was ruled at all. In the interest and convenience of the House, and, as I thought, of the regularity of our proceedings, I pointed out that this House was the guardian of order and that I was not, but that I thought that in the case of that particular Bill it would be impossible to contend with the other House that it was not an infringement of the privileges of the other House to change the destination of money voted. The section of the Act of 1897 which the noble Lord then proposed to amend provided that

> "For aiding voluntary schools there shall annually be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament an aid grant not exceeding in the aggregate 5s. per scholar."

and so forth. I thought then, and think now, that unless the House of Commons agreed to waive its privileges, the only result would be that your Lordships would debate those Amendments and that they would be summarily rejected in the other House. One noble Lord, I think, rather protested against that proceeding—it was the Earl of Camperdown—and thought it was undesirable to lay down any rule. For my own part I protest that I never affected to rule at all.

*EARL SPENCER: But the noble and learned Lord gave advice which was followed by the House.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: It seems a slight correction, but it is an important one. The House did not do anything of the sort. Every one of the noble Lords withdrew his Amendment on his own responsibility. The House did not act upon my advice. I should be happy and proud to think they had done so, but as a matter of fact they did not. The noble Lords themselves were convinced, I suppose, that what I had pointed out was the truth, and they withdrew their Amendments. Although I quite agree that this little discussion is convenient and advantageous to the House, when we are dealing with a question of this sort, to lay down *a priori* what you will do with reference to a particular Bill without knowing anything of the exact section which is the subject of discussion would be the most imprudent thing in the world. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to look at the Amendments that are suggested, and if the House is good enough to desire my advice I shall tell your

Lordships what I think about them. There are two or three questions which will arise. There will be not only the abstract question of whether or not if the House of Commons were to insist on its privileges such Amendments could be passed against them, but there will be the question whether, in reference to a Bill of very great importance, one might not fairly expect the House of Commons, even if they took the extreme view that it was against their privileges, to consider and possibly to agree to the Amendments or some of them. I have a great number of precedents where that very question has been discussed. At the instance of Lord John Russell, and with the full approval of the Speaker, in the case of the Irish Poor Law Bill the advice and assistance of your Lordships' House in framing the different Amendments to give effect to the real intentions of Parliament were treated as of most valuable importance to the community. I will just read one or two of the observations made on the subject. On the Order of the day being read for considering the Lords Amendments to the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill in the House of Commons on 24th July, 1838, the Speaker said:—

> "He owed it to himself to make a few observations to the House on the subject. The House was no doubt aware that when Amendments were made in any Bill sent up to the House of Lords which were considered at all likely to be an infringement of the privileges of this House it was customary to communicate with the Speaker on the subject. It so happened, therefore, that he had been applied to by a very distinguished person in reference to this Bill. In reply to questions which were put to him, he then said that if his opinion were called for on the subject of these Amendments he felt bound to say that he considered them as an infringement of the privileges of the Commons' House. But, at the same time, as the Bill was one of a very peculiar character, affecting not only the proprietors of the land but the great mass of the people of Ireland, and as the principle of rating was necessarily incidental to such a measure, he considered that if the privileges of this House were strictly pressed in such a case they would almost tend to prevent the House of Peers from taking such a measure into its consideration in a way that might be on all grounds advisable. . . . As the authorised guardian of the privileges of the House, he had thought it right to explain his conduct on the present occasion, which he trusted would meet with the approval of the House. At the same time he must add that he thought the privileges of this House would be best secured by being not too far pressed."

After receiving that advice from the Speaker, Lord John Russell said—

> "There was a very material Amendment with respect to which it was very probable that the Speaker might have to consider whether or not it came within the privileges of that House. It was, in the first place, an omission of a Clause inserted in that House with regard to £5 tenements; and, in the second place, a substitution of another Clause with respect to the charge which might be taken by the owners on the payment by rates of such tenements. According to the Bill as it went up from that House, the occupiers of tenements under the value of £5 were not in the first instance to pay the rate, but that they should have the power of charging the whole rate on the landlords. They were, therefore, *in limine,* exempt altogether from the rate. Now, the House of Lords had determined that these persons should, in the generality of instances pay the rate; at the same time they did not alter the total amount of rate, whatever it might be, which was settled by the board of guardians on application to the commissioners, and they proposed another Clause by which an arrangement took place between the landlords and tenants with regard to the small holdings. What the House of Lords proposed was, in substance, that the owner and the tenant should make an arrangement between themselves by which the owner might agree to a certain deduction not exceeding 10 per cent. for the sum to which the small tenements were liable, and with the approbation of the guardians, and the sanction of the commissioners, that such payment by the owners should exempt the occupiers of tenements. He thought it would be a very vexatious and inexpedient proceeding if they were to insist on this privilege as a ground of objection to this alteration. He thought it one of those alterations which didnot touch the general question of taxation. It was not with the view of exempting those persons as being a class which ought to be free from such a demand that the Clause was originally introduced."

The result of the discussions which then took place was that the whole of the Amendments of the Lords were discussed and some of them agreed to. If we substitute the question of Education for the question of Poor Law, every one of the observations then made would apply. I very much doubt whether, where the House of Commons was convinced that it was for the purpose of rendering a Bill more efficient, they would reject an Amendment. In those circumstances, I think it would be extremely rash for any one to predict, without hearing the discussion on each Clause, how an Amendment would be dealt with by the other House. If it were inconsistent with any control of the House of Commons over the funds provided by the Bill, very likely they would reject it, but if it were one intended to be ancillary and to give greater effect to what the House of Commons intended, then I should very much doubt whether the other House would think it necessary to assert their privileges in such a way as to prevent the Amendments moved in your Lordships' House from being adopted so as to improve the provisions of the Bill. I can only say that if my advice were asked I should wait to see what the concrete case was before I ventured to give your Lordships any advice whatever on the subject.

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, I agree with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that we must wait to see what the Amendments in a concrete case are before we can say that any particular Amendment would be contrary to what has been called the privileges of the Commons, but what I should prefer to call the constitutional law of the country. But I wish to point out that, if the Amendments to the Bill of 1897 were struck out because it was not thought right to pass Amendments which should be contrary to the constitutional law of the country, that would, it seems to me, cover almost any Amendment of substance—any Amendment that anybody would care to have—to the Bill that is coming before us. Suppose we find that the Bill grants a sum of, say, £1,300,000 for the sustenance of schools to be maintained, conducted, and managed in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. Can anybody possibly say that if we alter the provisions relating to the maintenance, conduct, or management of the schools in a material manner we are not altering one of the conditions, qualifications, and limitations—and, I would say, even the ends and purposes—for which the money grant is made by the Commons? Let me give a concrete example. I will take it that the Bill proposes that the School Boards at present existing should be abolished, and that their powers should be vested in a new local authority, to be constituted in a particular manner. Now, suppose Amendments were moved, altering in any way the constitution of the local authority, or even proposing that the School Boards should be retained in certain places, such as in big towns, for example, or doing anything to substantially affect the local authority which is to administer the Act. Can it be said for one moment that, either as a matter of form or of substance, such

Amendments would not affect the conditions, qualifications, or limitations upon the strength of which the grant had been made? As a matter of substance, I have no doubt they would. It seems to me that the principle upon which the House acted in 1897 would have a material effect upon the Amendments which might be moved, which were Amendments of any material value.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, it seems to me that the noble Lord who has just sat down has attributed an extremely wide effect to the advice that was given to the House in 1897, but has omitted to notice the preliminary words of the House of Commons Resolution on which that advice was founded. The Resolution which was quoted was as follows—

> "That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons, and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons."

The rest of the Resolution applies to what is to take place in regard to any such Bill. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, the Voluntary Schools Act was in its main purpose and intention a Bill for the granting of such aids and supplies. The substance of that Bill was to grant certain aids to voluntary schools, and, therefore, all the subsequent provisions in the Resolution of the House of Commons would apply to it. The Bill which your Lordships expect to receive this week does a great deal besides granting aids and supplies. In fact, a great part of the Bill does not refer to granting any aids and supplies at all. Therefore the provisions of that Resolution, which are directed to money Bills, need not apply to a Bill which is essentially not a money Bill.

LORD DAVEY: I would call the noble Duke's attention to the last part of the Resolution, viz.—

> "It is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: That applies to "all such Bills"—Bills for granting aids and supplics.

LORD DAVEY: A Bill which contains a Clause granting a named sum to His Majesty for certain purposes is, I think, conceived within the Clause.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, as my name has been mentioned by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, though I had forgotten having made any remarks on the occasion to which he referred, perhaps I may be allowed to say that I entirely concur with all that the Lord Chancellor has said tonight. I agree that it is much better not to express any opinion with regard to any Amendment which may be moved before we see the Amendment. In the meantime, as a Member of your Lordships' House, I protest against the statement which has been made that it is not in the power of your Lordships to make any Amendment of substance in such a Bill as the Education Bill which is coming before us. It is a Bill of a much larger character than the Bill of 1897, and contains not only a grant of money but many other matters on which it is probable that your Lordships would wish to express an opinion. It would be premature and extremely unwise at the present moment to impose any limit to any action we may see fit to take.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I wish for a moment to insist on the very great length to which the advice given by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack went with regard to the Bill of 1897. That Bill did not, as my noble friend has just said, deal merely with a money grant. There were four separate proposals in it—firstly, the proposed money grant of 5s. per child; secondly, the abolition of the 17s. 6d. limit; thirdly, the relief of voluntary schools from the payment of rates; and, fourthly, the very important provision, which was purely permissive, which allowed associations of schools to be formed, and these associations were to be allowed to be the channel by which the money grant was conveyed to the schools within their area. The first Amendment that was moved by my noble friend Lord Spencer proposed to limit the 5s. grant to those schools which were willing to have a certain number of parents on the Board of Management. I can well understand that Amendment being ruled out, because it struck out certain schools from receiving any grant at all. But Lord Kimberley moved an Amendment with regard to these associations which certainly did not involve any interference with the money grant. Lord Kimberley proposed that at least one-half of the managers of these associations of schools should be non-clerical. Nobody can say that would have interfered with the money grant, but on the advice of the noble Earl on the Woolsack that Amendment was decided to be incompetent.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Not decided.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: It was withdrawn.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: There was no division. We on this side of the House are in a peculiar position, and have very often to exercise that discretion which is the better part of valour. My point is that if the noble Earl on the Woolsack advises the House to follow the same advice that he gave with regard to Lord Kimberley's Amendment, that advice will be far-reaching indeed, and almost every Amendment will be cut out. I contend that the advice now suggested by the noble and learned Earl is entirely opposed to that which he gave in 1897. He now says: Let us wait for the Amendments, and, even if there should be one which clashes with the privileges of the House of Commons, the latter is very well able to take care of itself and can strike that Amendment out. In 1897, he said: Do not let us send down incompetent Amendments; do not let us discuss Amendments and be subject to the rebuff of having them struck out in the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: The noble Lord is inaccurate. I did not advise Lord Kimberley at all. Lord Kimberley came forward and said the argument appeared to him to cover his Amendment, and therefore he withdrew it.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: But you assented.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, in moving the adjournment of the House, said: It is hoped that the Education Bill may be read a third time in the other House on Wednesday, and this House will sit to whatever hour may be necessary to receive the Bill. It is proposed to take the Second Reading on Thursday.

EARL SPENCER: Will the Bill be in the hands of noble Lords before Thursday morning?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: The Bill, as amended on Report in the other House, will be circulated tomorrow morning.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till Tomorrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 1st December, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Skipton, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Forest Hill, against alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Nash Manor, and Llanvihangel; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Copy presented, of Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years which have not been presented for payment, and which have been written off on the 17th day of November, 1902, from the total amount of notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February (*Mr. Grant Lawson*)]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 384.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Bill—Position of Denominational Schools not under Trust Deeds.

MR. BRASSEY (Oxfordshire, Banbury): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will say whether, in the case of Church of England elementary schools built and maintained by landowners, where there is no trust deed, those who have built and maintained the schools will be able to nominate the four managers and to change them; will these schools be treated as denominational schools; and, if so, will he say under which Clauses of the Education Bill this is the case.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) In the cases mentioned the owners can apply for an Order under Clause 11, sub-Section (2), of the Bill, and in their application can set forth the scheme of appointment or nomination of foundation managers which they desire to see adopted. In many cases landowners who have built and maintained denominational schools on their property have power to secure the permanence of their denominational character by themselves making a trust deed without using the powers given by the Bill.

Education Bill — Position of Teachers transferred to Schools under Local Authorities.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in the event of the transfer of teachers from the school board pupil teacher centres to technical and secondary schools, they will lose the benefit of the superannuation scheme to which as elementary school teachers they have contributed under The Superannuation Act, 1898; and if it is intended to extend the benefits of the Superannuation Act to certificated teachers and to other registered teachers who are engaged in technical or secondary schools provided by the local authorities, whether or not they are employed exclusively in the instruction of pupil teachers.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) "Recorded service," for the purpose of The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, does not include service in technical and secondary schools. But teachers transferred to such schools will not lose the benefit of the contributions they have already made while in "recorded service." The Government have no intention of extending the provisions of the Superannuation Act.

Dingle Licensing Case.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the protest of the parish priest of Dingle against the action of the bench in that petty sessions district in granting new licences on the 14th instant; and whether, in view of the provisions of The Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902, he will state what course will be taken in respect of the action of the magistrates concerned and the licence so granted.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Canon O'Leary has already taken proceedings in the King's Bench Division to have the Order of the justices granting the licence brought up and quashed, on the ground that it contravenes the provisions of the recent Act. Whether the Crown will support or oppose this application will depend upon the view the Law Officers will take of the facts of the case and the law applicable to them.

Mediterranean Squadron—Ranking of Inspectors of Machinery.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he is aware that the Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Station has laid it down that for purposes of official entertainments engineer officers of the rank of Inspectors of Machinery shall rank with Commanders in command; and whether, in view of the fact that, according to the King's and Admiralty instructions, Inspectors of Machinery have the relative rank of Captain, he will take steps to ensure that these officers shall not be for social purposes degraded below their proper rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) No information has reached the Admiralty to the effect stated in the hon. Member's Question, but inquiry will be made, and

I shall be happy to answer a further Question on the subject when the reply has been received.

Kobe (Japan) Trade Report.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the fact that the recently issued Report of the trade of Kobe, Japan, shows that beverages to the value of £21,360 were exported from Kobe during the year 1900–1901, will he state the nature of the beverages referred to and what mineral waters are included.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The information which the hon. Member requires is not in the possession of the Foreign Office.

Russian Railway Construction in China.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have any information to the effect that Russia is constructing a branch line from the main Siberian railway in the direction of Pekin.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) No, Sir. His Majesty's Government have received no such information.

Island of Lewis Sanitation.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that Mr. Millar, the Local Government Board's inspecting officer, under the Public Health Act, visited the Island of Lewis in the month of May last, will the Secretary for Scotland state the names of the townships in the parishes of Stornoway, Barvas, Lochs, and Uig which were visited by the inspecting officer; and whether his report on sanitary matters contains any recommendations with a view to improve the sanitary conditions of those parishes.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) As I have already informed the hon. Member, in reply to Questions on the same subject on 5th and 18th November, Mr. Millar's visit on the occasion in question was mainly for Poor Law purposes, and the only report he made on sanitary matters had reference to Stornoway.

Island of Lewis—Proposed Dry Dock at Loch Holm.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Lewis and Harris Fishermen's Association have applied to the Congested Districts Board and Lewis District Committee for aid in the construction of a dry dock at Loch Holm, near Stornoway, Island of Lewis, and that the crews of sixty boats have offered to contribute £6 per boat in aid of the construction, and a further £3 per boat for the subsequent maintenance of the dock. And will arrangements be made for the Board's engineer to visit the site for the proposed dock.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Congested Districts Board have not received any applications as to this work from the statutory authority under the Act regulating such grants, *i.e.*, the County Council; but the petition from the Lewis and Harris Fishermen's Association, to which the hon. Member alludes, reached them on 22nd November, and the petitioners were informed of the proper procedure to follow on 26th November.

Jubaland Expedition, 1901—Batta for Indian Troops.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will say why Batta was refused to the officers of the Indian contingent which took part in the Jubaland expedition of 1901; and whether, seeing that batta is always allowed to Indian troops when in the field in addition to their pay, the Indian Government, in furnishing contingents to the Foreign Office for employment out of India, will take measures to secure that the troops and officers shall have all the privileges to which they would be entitled when employed in the Indian service.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) "Batta," or field allowance, is not claimable by the European officers of Indian regiments when on field service, although on special occasions the Government of India may authorise a gratuity, or "donation batta," after a campaign. The batta admissible to the

Native officers, non-commissioned officers, and men under Indian Rules was drawn by those who took part in the Jubaland Expedition of 1901. In all the expeditions in British East Africa in which Indian troops have been employed the Foreign Office has granted the same rates of pay and allowance as would have been drawn had the troops been employed under Indian conditions, and I have no doubt the same course will be followed on this occasion.

Great Western Railway—Accident at Westbourne Park.

Mr. PHILIPPS (Pembroke): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has caused inquiry to be held into the accident on the Great Western Railway on Friday, 19th September; and whether he has received a report on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) An inquiry has been held as to the accident at Westbourne Park on the date mentioned, and the Report was issued to the Press on the 8th ultimo. I shall be happy to send a copy to the hon. Member.

Irish Dictionaries at Post Offices.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Postmaster General whether with the view of facilitating the delivery of letters addressed in the Irish language he will take steps to provide each post office with an Irish dictionary.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I do not consider that the circumstances are such as to justify the provision of Irish dictionaries at post offices.

Liverpool Female Postal Employees' Grievances.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that with one exception the female assistant supervisors employed at the counter offices in Liverpool have been at their maximum salaries for periods ranging from five to ten years, will he say whether he proposes to apply any, and, if so, what remedy.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The fact that these officers are at their maximum salary does not, in my opinion constitute any ground for complaint. It has been repeatedly decided by my predecessors that the salary of the assistant supervisors is sufficient for the duties performed; but as I have recently received an application on the subject from those employed at Liverpool, the question shall be again examined and my decision shall be announced to the applicants in due course.

Postal Circulation of Lottery and Gambling Circulars.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that in the West Country, and other parts of the United Kingdom, lottery and gambling circulars are being distributed through the post; and whether he can see his way to make the sending of these circulars through the post a punishable offence.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) When lottery circulars are posted in open covers they are withheld from delivery. But the majority of these circulars appear to be sent in closed envelopes, and as the Post Office has no cognizance of the contents of such envelopes, the transmission of the packets cannot be prevented. I do not think that I should be justified in seeking powers to interfere with any closed letters.

Naval Gunnery—Rewards for Proficiency.

Mr. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the regulations governing rewards for good shooting in His Majesty's Navy have been altered in any respect since the introduction of quick-firing guns, and, if so, will he say what the alterations are; and will he acquaint the House with the regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Since the introduction of quick-firing guns the regulations governing rewards for proficiency in gunnery have been altered by the establishment of:—(1) Prizes for light quick-firing and machine guns; (2) Quarterly prize firings in addition to the annual prize firings. The regulations are to the following effect:—Annual Prize Firings—A sum of money, varying according to the complement of the ship, is allowed for prizes for shooting with heavy guns. A sum of money is also provided for prizes for shooting with light quick-firing and machine guns. Quarterly Prize Firings—A sum of money, varying according to the complement, is allowed for prizes for shooting with heavy and light guns. In every case the distribution of this sum is left absolutely to the discretion of the commanding officer of the ship, who settles the amount of individual shares, and is also empowered to withhold the whole or part of it should the results of the firing have been, in his opinion, unsatisfactory.

Tunbridge Wells Telephones.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to a proposal to sell to a private company the municipal telephone property at Tunbridge Wells, which was acquired a short time since under a loan sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and that this step is being taken by a newly elected Council on the grounds that the working of the undertaking has shown a slight loss; and whether, under these circumstances, he is willing to hold a local inquiry so that the exact facts as to the position of the undertaking may be ascertained before the precedent is set up of disposing in this way of public property which has been acquired by means of a Government loan.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) An application has been made to me by a Committee representing ratepayers of Tunbridge Wells to direct a local inquiry into the matter referred to. I have, however, no jurisdiction in regard to the proposed assignment of the telephone undertaking, and any application in connection with the subject should be addressed to the Postmaster General, whose consent to the assignment is required under the licence granted by him to the Town Council. I have informed the Committee accordingly.

Irish National School Teachers' Salaries.

Mr. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, having regard to the fact that the Commissioners of National Education, when fixing the consolidated salaries of Irish National School teachers on the basis of the average income for the three years ending 31st March, 1900, made application to the Treasury to allow in some cases a consolidated income equal to the earnings for the year ending 31st March, 1900, will he say whether this application was granted; and, if not, will he state the reasons upon which it was refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A proposal was made to the Treasury to the effect stated in the first part of the Question. The Treasury did not see its way to agree to the proposal.

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland—Canal Traffic Tolls.

Mr. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state whether the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction will exercise its powers under Section 17 of The Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, of appearing before the Railway and Canal Commissioners on behalf of the boat owners on the Royal Canal, who feel aggrieved by reason of the tolls charged by the Midland Great Western Railway on canal traffic, when added to working expenses, being in excess of the freight charged on that company's railway for the same class of goods, thereby destroying the competition of the canal.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Department has not yet completed its inquiries in this matter, and is unable at present to say whether action is practicable in the direction suggested.

Royal Commission on Civil Service Superannuation.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to nominate the Royal Commission on the Deferred Pay of Civil Servants; and if an opportunity will be afforded of discussing the terms of reference.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Royal Commission to inquire into Superannuation in the Civil Service was commenced last week. The terms of reference were given by me in the House of Commons last summer.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

British Troops in South Africa.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the number of the British forces now in South Africa.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The number roughly amounts to about 55,000, including some troops awaiting transport to India.

British Army Headquarters in Natal.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state where are the permanent military headquarters of the British Army in Natal.

LORD STANLEY: The question of the permanent headquarters in Natal is at present under consideration with the Natal Government.

War Gratuities to Civilian Veterinary Surgeons.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that civilian veterinary surgeons employed at home by the military authorities during the recent war are to receive certain gratuities under the Royal Warrant published in Army Order 186, whether he will explain why civilian surgeons are not to receive these gratuities; and whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of the agreements under which each class was employed.

LORD STANLEY: The civilian veterinary surgeons employed at home do not get the gratuity referred to. My right hon. friend is not willing to lay these agreements on the Table, but I shall be most happy to show copies of them privately to the hon. Member.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Militia and Yeomanry Bill, and if he will ensure that a reasonable time be given for its discussion.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am unable to fix a date for this Bill. I am not prepared to say what would be a "reasonable time" for its discussion; but I should be sorry if the House were not able to discuss it adequately

Afghanistan.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can, consistently with public policy, give the House any information as to the present state of affairs in Afghanistan, and the date of the latest communication received by the Government of India from the Amir Habibullah; whether any communications have reached the Government of India as to the pretentions of Mahomed Omar Khan; whether, in the event of troubles arising in Afghanistan, the support of His Majesty's Government will be accorded to the present Amir; and whether, and if so, when, Papers will be laid before the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): My hon. friend asks me four Questions. My reply to the first is that the latest communication received from the Amir of Afghanistan by the Government of India was on the 15th October and related to the boundary dispute in Seistan. To the second, No. The third is of too hypothetical a character to admit of a definite reply. To the fourth, No.

Indian Native Army—Promotion of Colonels.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state why colonels promoted major-generals under the new warrant which came into force in 1901 have been antedated to 1900, thus superseding the colonels of the Native Army by three years, their promotion having been stopped since October, 1900, both under the new and old warrants.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no information on the subject of the hon. and gallant Member's Question, which should be addressed to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War.

But I may point out that, as British major-generals are on one list and Indian major-generals upon another. there can be no question of supersession,

Russia and Afghanistan.

MR. KIMBER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will inform the House as to the latest communications which have passed between the Government of His Imperial Majesty the Czar and His Majesty's Ministers relative to Russia's desire to bring about close commercial relations with Afghanistan; and whether he has any information to show that the Russian Government have already entered into direct communication with the Amir on the subject.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): As regards the first part of the Question I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave to the hon. Member for Central Hull on the 20th October.† The answer to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

Russian Consuls in Persia.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Russian Government have appointed a Russian Consul at Ahwaz on the Karun River in Persia; whether the Belgian Customs officials employed by the Persian Government have made any, and if so, what, alterations in the system of collecting duties on or near that river; and whether His Majesty's Government will lay on the Table the Papers showing the terms set forth by the Persian Government when opening the navigation of the Karun River.

LORD CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government understand that a Russian Consular agent has been appointed for Arabistan. The Customs duties on the Karun with which we are principally concerned have hitherto been collected at the ports of destination, but the Persian Government now wish to collect all such duties at Mohammerah. His Majesty's Legation at Teheran are in communication with them on the subject. It would not be desirable to lay Papers at present.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the noble Lord promise Papers when the negotiations are concluded?

LORD CRANBORNE: I do not think I can enter into any engagement.

Railways in Southern Persia.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government are aware that a Commission of engineers has been sent out from Paris to survey southern Persia for railways and other public works; whether that Commission has been established and sent out in connection with the negotiations between Russia and Persia for the construction of railways in southern Persia; and what steps have been taken by His Majesty's Government to secure the interests of British trade in Persia and the position of this country in the Persian Gulf.

LORD CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have seen the Report which has appeared in the Press to the effect stated in the first portion of the Question. A communication from the Persian Minister at Paris has, however, appeared in the *Matin* of the 26th of November, stating that he is authorised to deny the Report.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The noble Lord has not answered the last part of my Question.

LORD CRANBORNE: The security of the interests of this country in the Persian Gulf has always been a matter of the utmost concern to His Majesty's Government.

Tunbridge Wells Telephone Dispute.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he has yet arrived at any decision with regard to the application of the Town Council of Tunbridge Wells for his sanction to the sale of the municipal telephone system of that borough to the National Telephone Company.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiii., 208.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have not yet been able to arrive at a decision on this important question.

Education Bill—Governors of Secondary Schools.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will say whether, amongst the powers transferred by the Education Bill from a School Board to the local authority is the power to appoint governors of a secondary school where that power is now conferred by the trust.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): A power so conferred would be included in the "property, rights, and liabilities" of a School Board which are transferred by Rule (1) of Schedule II.

Education Bill—Compensation to Voluntary School Teachers not engaged by Local Authorities.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, as provision has been made in the Education (England and Wales) Bill for compensation to teachers now employed in board schools who are not re-engaged by the new education authority, this provision will be extended to voluntary school teachers in corresponding cases.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The Education Bill will not invalidate existing contracts between teachers and School Boards or the managers of voluntary schools. In the case of School Boards such contracts are transferred by express provision to the new authority, because one of the parties to the contract—the School Board—will cease to exist. In the case of the voluntary schools both parties will continue in existence, and there is therefore no necessity for any such provision. The Bill gives no compensation to teachers, in either class of school, who are not re-engaged at the termination of their present contracts.

Fees in Public Elementary Schools.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Board of Education will present to Parliament a Return showing the total number of public elementary schools in England and Wales, in which fees are now charged, the number of the fee-paying scholars in those schools, and the fees which are actually charged.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: A Return will be given.

Education Bill—Religious Instruction—Appeal to the Bishop.

MR. KENYON (Denbigh): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in the event of an appeal to the Bishop of the diocese, under sub-Section (4) of Clause 7 of the Education Bill, proving to be in favour of the incumbent of the parish, he will have any legal power of asserting his position as against his co-manager; and if so, by what process.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The only reference to the Bishop, in my view of this Clause, will be on any question as to the nature of the religious teaching. On every other question—as to the management of the religious teaching, how it is to be given, and by whom—the managers will have full control, and no appeal will lie against this decision. If the managers should infringe the terms of the trust as regards the character of the religious instruction as defined by the deed itself, or by the Bishop on reference in terms of the deed, the proper remedy would be, as in the case of any abuse of a charitable trust, by an information in the name of the Attorney General.

Post Office Telephones in Irish Rural Districts.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether telephonic communication for the convenience of the Post Office has been established between outlying villages and the county towns in the rural districts of Ireland; if so, whether these telephones can be used by the public; and, if not, whether some arrangements could be made to render them available at a small charge for each conversation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The lines referred to have been provided for the transmission of telegrams, and they are terminated at the central telegraph offices in the district. They are not, generally speaking, suitable for use in conjunction with the telephone trunk wire system, as in most cases they are single wire circuits; but it may be possible in some cases to arrange for their use for ordinary telephonic conversation between the places which they already connect, and this is, as I understand, what the hon. Member desires. I will look carefully into the matter and see what can be done.

Sunday Postal Deliveries in Hillstreet, County Roscommon.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been directed to the public inconvenience caused to the inhabitants of the town of Hillstreet, County Roscommon, by the fact that there is no delivery or despatch of letters on Sundays from the local post office; and whether he can state when it is proposed to institute a Sunday delivery of letters at Hillstreet.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will make inquiry on the question of establishing a Sunday post to and from Hillstreet, County Roscommon, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Donegal, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Local Government Board auditor certified on 27th September, 1902, that the tax levied upon the guaranteeing area for the Buncrana to Carndonagh Railway was fully justified and was paid legally by the County Council of Donegal, and that the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland have been advised that the County Council were not bound to make any payment under the guarantee until the line was open for traffic, and that payments certified by the Local Government Board auditor were consequently illegal, will the auditor be called upon by the Local Government Board for an explanation; and will steps be taken to have the amount so paid and levied recouped to the ratepayers of the guaranteeing area?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. The Local Government Board auditor did not decide that these payments were legal. He merely decided that he had no power to go behind the certificates of the arbitrators appointed under the 6th Section of the Tramway Act of 1883. The Board of Works have been advised that the arbitrators acted *ultra vires* in granting these certificates; that their award was not binding on the Council; and that the payment of the sum of £300 thereunder was a voluntary payment, which they were not bound to make. It is for the County Council to take legal proceedings to have the matter determined, not for the Government.

State Purchase of Irish Railways.

MR. CAREW: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Donegal, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the fact that with the view of carrying out the purchase of Irish railways Mr. Thomas Robertson was appointed Chairman of the Irish Board of Works, and that Mr. Robertson reported favourably on a scheme of buying out the railways, will he lay upon the Table of the House a copy of Mr. Robertson's report and other communications relating thereto?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already pointed out that the First Lord, in April, 1897, stated that he knew of no reason for departing from the conclusions of the Royal Commissions appointed in 1865 and 1886, which were adverse to the policy of State purchase, and that I was not prepared to recommend the appointment of a third Royal Commission. I have no knowledge that Mr. Robertson was appointed Chairman of the Board of Works with the object alleged, or that he made any report or other communication on the matter.

Sunday Demonstrations at Downpatrick.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 23rd November last, a demonstration, accompanied with bands from different parts of Ireland, paraded the streets of Downpatrick during the hours of divine service, to the annoyance of those attending; and whether he proposes to take any steps to put a stop to conduct of such a character.

MR. WYNDHAM: There was a demonstration with bands as stated. But the bands did not play when passing places of worship. The demonstration was orderly, and no complaint of annoyance was made by any person. It is not proposed to interfere with orderly demonstrations.

MR. SLOAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at one place of worship the minister had to cease preaching for some minutes.

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member will give me particulars, I will cause further inquiry to be made.

Physical Science and Manual Instruction in Ireland.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that no provision has been made for the qualification of teachers in physical science and manual instruction, he will explain why the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland make it compulsory for a teacher in needlework to be trained in these subjects before receiving any salary.

MR. WYNDHAM: Teachers of needlework are not required to qualify in physical science and manual instruction. Provision has been made for the training of teachers in both of the latter subjects.

Newtown Butler Petty Sessions.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at Newtown Butler Petty Sessions, held on 18th November last, the district inspector complained that some days previously a magistrate had privately tried a case that should have been brought before that Court; and whether he will state what was the charge in the case complained of, and where that trial took place.

MR. WYNDHAM: The district inspector made no complaint. He merely pointed out that two cases of drunkenness which should have been disposed of in Petty Sessions were dealt with at the residence of a local justice of the peace. The action of the justice was irregular, though well meant.

District Inspector Rogers, of Trim.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Inspector General has made any inquiry as to the terms on which District Inspector Rogers occupies the disused military barracks at Trim; what yearly lodging allowance does this officer receive; and whether he proposes to hold any public investigation into these matters.

MR. WYNDHAM: I informed the hon. Member on 7th August last that this district inspector receives the ordinary lodging allowance, namely, £40 per annum, payable to all officers of his rank who are not accommodated with quarters in constabulary barracks. The reply to the first and third inquiries is in the negative.

Dog Poisoning at Ballaghaderreen.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police have made any report as to the recent poisoning of dogs in Ballaghaderreen; and whether, in view of the claims for compensation made to the Rural District Council, the police will be instructed to furnish a copy of their report to the members of that body.

MR. WYNDHAM: The district inspector of constabulary has forwarded to the District Council a statement of the occurrence required to be made in such cases to the local authorities.

Cost of Extra Police in Tallow.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he can state what was the total cost of the extra police in the Tallow district, County Waterford, during the last twelve months; to what area has it been charged; and how much of it has been already levied on the ratepayers.

MR. WYNDHAM: The area of charge comprises seventy townlands. The cost to local rates in respect of the extra force sent to the district in August, 1901, is £345 a year. A claim for £39 16s. 9d. has already been made; a further claim will shortly be made. There will also be a levy on account of fifty men sent to Tallow last week from another county.

Glasnevin Lectures on Bee-keeping.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds Mr. J. M. Gillies has been appointed lecturer in bee-keeping in Glasnevin, and examiner of candidates for appointments as county instructors in bee-keeping; and whether, before making future appointments, the views of the Irish Bee-keepers' Association will be ascertained by the Department of Agriculture.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Gillies is an expert in the subject. The Department will be happy to consider the claims of any candidates for such appointments which may be forwarded by the Association in question.

MR. TULLY: Did not the Bee-keepers' Association declare that Mr. Gillies knew nothing about the subject, and did he not come straight from the staff of the *Freeman's Journal*?

MR. WYNDHAM: As I said, Mr. Gillies is an expert. I did not know he was a journalist.

Roscommon Union Hospital.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board will order a sworn inquiry into the state of things alleged to exist in the Roscommon union hospital at the last meeting of the Guardians.

MR. WYNDHAM: A sworn inquiry has been ordered.

Irish Poor Law Medical Officers' Holidays.

MR. CAREW: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Monaghan I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the dissatisfaction at present prevailing amongst the medical officers of the Irish Poor Law service in consequence of the abrogation by the Local Government Board of their bye-law granting the medical officers, as a right, four weeks' holiday in each year; and if he will give such directions as will cause the re-enactment of the bye-law.

MR. WYNDHAM: Article 28 of the Dispensary Regulations provides that each medical officer shall be allowed an annual vacation not exceeding four weeks. But since that Regulation was made, a Court of Law has held that it is not incumbent on a Board of Guardians grant the full period of four weeks.

Infirm Inmates of Irish Workhouses.

MR. CAREW: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Monaghan I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in some Irish workhouses the infirm inmates have to lie on trestle bedsteads with straw mattresses and pillows, and are without properly qualified nurses or attendance; and if he will direct an inquiry into the condition of these institutions.

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member will kindly give particulars of the cases he refers to, inquiries will be made into the matter. The Board is doing all in its power to ameliorate the condition of the sick and infirm in workhouses.

Education Bill—Teachers' Superannuation.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state what provision will be made to safeguard the superannuation rights of teachers transferred from School Boards to the authorities set up under the Education Bill; and whether the teachers' years of service for superannuation purposes will count from the date of his original appointment by the School Board or other school authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The rights of teachers are in no way affected.

Manuscript Amendments without Notice.

MR. KENYON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of placing some limitations on the practice of moving Amendments in manuscript of which no notice has been given, and which, owing to the acoustic properties of the House, are mainly unintelligible to a majority of Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Undoubtedly the practice of handing in manuscript Amendments is capable of abuse; but I do not quite see how that abuse is to be restricted without unduly limiting the power of the House in Committee. It would be absolutely necessary, of course, to forbid all Amendments without notice; and it might not be desirable to tie the hands of the Committee in that way. But if we did not, it is difficult to see what limitation ought to be put on this power, though I quite recognise the importance of the matter to which the hon. Member alludes.

The New Questions Rule.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House, verbally or otherwise, the information sought in the Return, Business of the House (Time occupied in the giving of Oral Answers to Questions), appearing on this day's Notice Paper.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend must not take the information which I am about to give him as necessarily representing with absolute accuracy the statistics which he desires. But I understand that oral questions have been disposed of before half-past two on nineteen days; before a quarter to three on forty days; and before five minutes to three on thirteen days. Oral questions have remained undisposed of at five minutes to three on two occasions—on June 23rd and on October 20th. An interesting letter embodying some other statistics, if my right hon. friend cares to refer to it, will be found in *The Times* of September 5th, over the signature "George Walpole."†

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

John Cathcart Wason, esquire, for the County of Orkney and Zetland.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Patent Law Amendment Bill, with Amendments.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROCEDURE.

(2.35) THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not propose to make any additional statement about these Rules which I now propose shall be made Standing Orders, they having been discussed already at great length. All I shall ask the House to do is to take such measures as to prevent the discussion we have already had of these new proposals from being wholly wasted and dropped at the end of the Session. I beg to move—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Resolutions dealing with the Power of the Speaker to Adjourn the House or Suspend Sitting, Priority of Business, Business in Supply, Private Business, and Quorum of the House, be Standing Orders of the House, and that Standing Orders 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 be repealed."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) thought that the treatment extended to the House by the right hon. Gentleman was somewhat cavalier. It was true that some of the Resolutions had been discussed under the pressure of the Closure, but it was not true to say that there had been any discussion of the important points as to whether the experience by the House of the Sessional Orders warranted it at this moment in taking this step. He therefore regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had thought fit to move this Motion formally without giving any reasons for the course he asked the House to take. The Resolution was entirely different from that which had stood on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Gentleman for some time. It proposed to make five Sessional Orders into Standing Orders, and to repeal Standing Orders 10 and 11—action which was, no doubt, consequentially necessary on the conversion of the Sessional Orders into Standing Orders. But it also imported entirely new and original matter. It proposed to repeal Standing Orders 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, which had nothing whatever to do with the Sessional Orders under consideration. He did not know on what principle the right hon. Gentleman could put all these things into one and the same Resolution, but they being there he would have liked to have had some explanation. That, however, was not forthcoming, and he must deal with the Resolution as it stood.

---

† Among the Appendices to the final volume of the present session, will be found a Table shewing in detail the working of the new Rule. [ED.]

First, he would remark that the Standing Orders which it was proposed to repeal raised some serious questions. They dealt with the morning sittings, with the priority of the Orders of the day, and with Supply on Friday, two of them raising the whole question as between Wednesday and Friday, and the others the dinner-hour interval. But he did not propose to deal with those at all. His proposition was two-fold. First, he held that at this period of the Session, and in the present exceptional circumstances, the House ought not to be asked to take the very serious decision which was involved in making these provisions Standing Orders; next, that the House had nothing like the adequate experience of the Sessional Orders to warrant it taking this serious step. The sittings in which they were now engaged were entirely exceptional—they were undertaken for the purpose of considering the Education Bill; they were held after the Appropriation Act had been passed, and they should have been confined to the consideration of the Education Bill. But that had not been so. There had been the consideration of the Brussels Convention; new Supply had been set up, and another Appropriation Act had been passed. These matters had taken up much of the time of the House. The present sittings of the House had, moreover, undoubtedly caused a great stress to be put on Members, and at the end of the sittings on the Education Bill there was still a great deal of work to do. The Education Bill had still to be read a third time, and it was possible when it came back from the other House they would have a great deal more work to do. There was, too, the London Water Bill to be passed, and in consequence of the stress put upon them, especially by the Education Bill Members had not had time to prepare themselves for the debates on the proposal now before them. He thought that the Government were making a very unwise proposal. They had had practically no experience of the Sessional Orders now proposed to be made Standing Orders.

The least contentious of them was that which gave the Speaker the power to adjourn the House at his discretion. That was passed on the 17th February; others were passed on 11th and 28th April, and two not later than the 1st May, so that of these latter ones they had only had sixty-five days ordinary session experience. These Sessional Orders were more or less revolutionary, and the experience of them had been so short that it was not sufficient to warrant the House in making them binding on its proceedings for ever. The Order which gave the Speaker power to adjourn the House without Question put, in case of grave disorder, or to suspend the sitting was a most portentous provision. It contemplated a state of things which had never yet occurred, and a kind of Speaker who had never sat in that Chair. It contemplated a state of things in which Members were in a state of riot and violence, and the Speaker so distracted that he could think of nothing but flight. What a picture! He did not believe that any necessity of that kind would ever arise in the House. It never had arisen. He did not believe that in the lifetime of any of them they would ever see both the Speaker and the House lose their heads together. Yet the Government manifestly contemplated such scenes of violence, and he was inclined to think that the sort of attitude they were adopting, and the sort of system they were inaugurating, were such as might conceivably lead to the scenes they were providing for by the Sessional Order. The kind of autocracy that was beginning to be shown, the militarism, the processionalism, the medallism, and the whole machinery by which it seemed to be sought to substitute an autocracy for free Government were in such full swing that he knew not what might befal them, and what might be the effect on the people and, through them, on the House. It might be that the

Government was providing for the danger which it contemplated as likely to arise in the immediate future. He could only remind the House that on the last occasion on which a Speaker tried to adjourn the House without Question put he was held down in the chair by two Members, and scenes of the greatest possible violence ensued. Instead, therefore, of being calculated to assuage violence, this Order might add to the difficulties of legislation and violence of the scenes. He need not deal further with that, however, as he did not think the Order would ever be brought into action, unless, indeed, the Government contemplated a course which he should be sorry to see them adopt. This was however, the Standing Order to which he had the least objection.

The next Order as to priority of business was an important one, because it divided the time between the Government and the private Members. During many centuries the rule of the House had been that the principal persons to be considered were not the placemen who sat on the Front Bench, but the free representatives of the country, who sat on the other Benches, and the House gave effect to this view of the relative importance of the two sets by allocating three-fifths of the time to private Members and two-fifths to the placemen who formed the Government. Under this Sessional Order this had been very much changed. There were now nine sittings a week, and the House sat forty hours weekly. Before Easter the private Member was to have eleven and a half out of the forty hours, after Easter eight and a half, after Whitsuntide nothing, and after Michaelmas eight and a half again. That was laid down by the Order. Thus before Easter the private Member was to get from one-third to one-fourth, before Whitsuntide something between one-fourth and one-fifth, and after Whitsuntide nothing. But the Government this year had arranged matters very differently. The Government began taking priority for its Procedure Rules on the 30th January on every day except Wednesday, and no sooner had the House met on the 16th October than it took the whole time for Government business. As a matter of fact, what had the private Member had this year? The House met on 16th January; it had sat 166 days, but 28 of those had consisted of two sittings. Adding the 28 to the 166, the House had had 194 sittings. Now, if private Members had had what was given to them by the Sessional Order, they would have had 40 sittings out of 194. As a matter of fact, they had only had 18, or about one-tenth of the whole. On the introduction of the Rule the First Lord of the Treasury admitted that he was going to deprive the private Member to a large extent of most of his privileges, but said the consolation would be that what was left to the private Member would really be left to him as it never had been before. But it was not so. The one consolation left to him had been withdrawn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Can you give me any evidence of that?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman does not pay that attention which he would if my speeches did not bore him so much. As I have said, there have been 194 sittings, and under this Sessional Order the private Member would have been entitled to 40.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: When did it come into force?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It was agreed to on the 11th of April.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The 5th of May.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he was showing what the effect on the whole session had been of the action of the Government in conjunction with the Standing Order, but since 5th May, when this particular Sessional Order came into force——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Is there a single evening sitting subsequent to this Order coming into force which the private Members had and of which they have been deprived?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Certainly.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: How many?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: They have only had Wednesday, the 7th, and Friday, 9th May, Wednesday, 14th May, and Fridays, the 6th and the 13th June, and Friday, the 25th July, when the financial relations with Ireland were considered. After Whitsuntide the private Member has had three evenings, and three alone, since this Sessional Order came into force, and has been deprived of all others. After Michaelmas he has had none. Now he hoped the right hon. Gentleman was answered.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Indeed I am not.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: If I do not understand the Sessional Order, how are other Members of the House to understand it? He repeated that since the Order came into force private Members had not had the share of time which it gave them, while since October 16th private Members had not had a single evening, although under it they were supposed to have all the Tuesday and Wednesday evening sittings and all Fridays. Therefore, it was perfectly ludicrous to ask the House to pretend to believe that nothing had been taken from them. Everything had been taken from them, except the sittings he had just cited. The Sessional Order which they were told had been arranged so as to make more certain the few remaining privileges the Government had been pleased to leave them, had in operation given them not more, but far less, certainty. The Sessional Order relating to Private Bill legislation was also of very great importance, having regard to the tremendous interests which were involved. The Secretary of State for the Colonies said the subject was surrounded with so much difficulty that it would have to be considered by a Committee, and as a matter of fact the Prime Minister himself, on May 28th, came to the conclusion that it was best to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the whole subject. That Committee had not yet reported.

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrewshire, W.): It has reported.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Where is the Report?

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW: On the Table.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked what was the good of telling them it had been laid on the Table, when not a single Member of the House, except those who signed it, knew its contents. For all effectual purposes the Committee had not yet reported. The House was absolutely ignorant of the nature of the Report, and it might indeed be such as to render it absolutely necessary for them to reconsider this Sessional Order. They could not read into the mind of the hon. Member what his Report was. It was a mockery to come to the House and ask them to adopt this as a Standing Order, and fasten upon the House for all time an Order of so doubtful a character, and so questionable in its effect. It was indecent of the Government not to await the Report of their own Committee before asking them to make that most important Sessional Order, dealing with most tremendous interests, into a Standing Order.

Then he came to the Sessional Order relating to a quorum of the House and its adjournment. To him this was one of the most obnoxious of them all. In all the ninety-eight existing Standing Orders of the House there was no mention whatever of a quorum. A quorum of forty for the House had never been so much as suggested until now. The true quorum was not the forty which was first initiated by the Long Parliament, and which was now considered an adequate representation of this great Assembly. It was a quorum, to use the old phrase, of "all or most" of the House, or of one-half the House, plus one, which all the civilised nations had taken from us, and which had been adopted by the United States, France, Belgium, Italy, and Spain. Hatsell told us that in 1607 on the 20th April "no Bill was read this day, and the House arose at ten o'clock, being not above three score." That House consisted of 470 Members, so that one-eighth was not considered enough to read a Bill in those days, whereas one-sixteenth was considered sufficient now. The evil precedent set by the Long Parliament was one of which the House was so ashamed that it had never put it into its Standing Orders. But this Sessional Order in reality abolished the quorum altogether from nine to ten o'clock. Without this Order, if the House were counted and there were not forty Members present, it would at once be adjourned, and the Bill under discussion would become a dropped Order. But, according to this Order, they might count as much as they liked, but the House did not adjourn. They went on, quorum or no quorum. It was a quorum which was no quorum, and a House which was no House. There was a division; the figures showed that there were not forty Members present; and then, forsooth! they who were not good enough for the immediate business were to be good enough for the next. If on the next Bill another division took place, and still forty Members were not present, the House at once proceeded to the third Bill. Was there anything out of comic opera equal to that? His right hon. friend, in introducing this extraordinary proposal, gave this reason—

> "It will be remembered that the controversial Private Bill procedure comes on at nine o'clock. It will be hard on promoters if it is in the power of any hon. Member to call attention to the fact that forty Members are not present; and the plan we have suggested is that no 'count' shall be allowed before ten o'clock."

According to the right hon. Gentleman the reason for this Sessional Order was that it was to preserve the rights of those interested in Private Bill business. The suggestion was that if a Private Bill involving great interests to the public and the promoters came on at nine o'clock, and someone suddenly counted out the House, the Bill would disappear, and that it could be heard of no more. That was not so. The Private Bill would become a dropped Order, but it could be set up again next day. The promoters had only to go to the Private Bill Office to have that done. He did not know but that the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means could do it. The Bill would be no worse off without this Order than with it. Therefore the only reason, or rather pretence of a reason, assigned by the right hon. Gentleman entirely disappeared, and the Sessional Order stood in all its naked absurdity and repulsive nonsense. That clearly was not the real reason. What was the real reason? The real reason manifestly was that when they had made a dinner interval and turned Members out of the House at half-past seven, they could not expect them to come back before ten o'clock—or that if this was expected they would not come. Of course the making of such a Sessional Order as this was an encouragement not to come back before ten o'clock. An hon. Member would say, "They can't ruin the Empire until ten o'clock, and therefore at ten o'clock I shall go back, but not before." It had so acted. This Government, which had a majority of 130—or, rather he understood that on account of recent events it was now 128—had had its majority reduced to 17 when a division was taken soon after nine o'clock.

Let the Government consider the whole effect of their Sessional Orders. Were they adopted merely for the humour of the moment and the occasional convenience of the present Government, or were they considered with respect to the probable general future of the House? Surely they must know that under an Order such as this no Government would ever be safe between nine and ten that had a majority of under 100. For that reason he should have expected that the Whips of the Government would have thought that this Order should receive reconsideration from the point of view of the Government themselves. Surely it was not one which should be passed in a hurry, and with so small an experience of it as that which they had had.

The whole of the Standing Orders, Sessional Orders and Rules embodied in the Book laid on the Table of the House were contradictory, inconsistent and confused. They were altered from time to time with nobody knowing of the alteration. They were really in a state of absolute chaos. It was necessary for the credit of the House, and for the information of Members who desired to know under what sort of law they were living, that the whole of the Orders and Rules should be reconsidered, that they should be co-ordinated so as to be made consistent with one another, and that they should be put in such a form that they could be understood by the newest of new Members. That could only be done with a little leisure. He would suggest—if indeed it were of any use to suggest anything—that they should pass the repeal of Standing Orders 4 to 8, which were consequential to the Standing Orders already adopted, and that, as to the rest of the

Sessional Orders these should be re-introduced next session. They had never yet had a whole session's experience of these Orders. They ought to have a session's experience as to how they did work, and then at the end of the session they could be proposed as Standing Orders. That, it appeared to him, would have been a reasonable course to take.

In regard to the Supply Rule, the hon. Member said it was a remarkable instance of the careless and inconsiderate way in which the Rules altogether were drawn, and of the contradiction and chaos he had mentioned. It said—

> "On a day so allotted [for Supply] no other business than the Business of Supply shall be taken."

On the other hand the Order relating to "Private Business" said—

> "All private business which is set down for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, and is not disposed of by fifteen minutes after Two of the clock shall, without Question put, be postponed until such time as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine."

The two rules were inconsistent. If the Chairman of Waysand Means determined that private business should stand over to the evening sitting on an allotted Supply might it was inconsistent with the Supply Rule, which said that on a day allotted for Supply "no business other than the business of Supply shall be taken before midnight." Yet it had happened twice or three times that private business had been taken on the evening of a day allotted for Supply, and that had been done in direct contradiction of this Sessional Order. He did not think his right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury could have contemplated this because he made a great point of the fact that nothing but Supply should be taken on a Supply day, and that Supply should be all over by twelve o'clock. He thought he had shown that the intention of the Standing Order had been defeated—he did not say improperly—and that business other than that of Supply had been taken on an allotted day. Moreover, there was another point in the Supply Order to which he desired to direct attention. It said—

> "Any additional Estimate for any new matter not included in the original Estimates for the year shall be submitted for consideration in the Committee of Supply on some day not later than two days before the Committee is closed."

Well, in Committee of Supply during these very sittings they had had additional matter which was not included in the original Estimates, nor submitted two days before, but more than two months after the Committee had been closed. He was not saying that it was out of order. Heaven forbid that he should suggest a construction of the Rule which would be difficult for His Majesty's Government, but he did say that what had been done was absolutely contrary to the direct meaning of the Rule as he understood it. Surely if ever a Rule required a little reconsideration it was this. Then the seventh paragraph of this Sessional Order which provided for the guillotine, not merely of Votes but of whole classes of Votes at once, was entirely new and wholly revolutionary, because it denied the House of Commons the power of saying "Aye" on one Vote, and "No'' on another. It had never been suggested or proposed before. That also was a matter for reconsideration.

As the House would have seen he had avoided raising any questions of formality. The matters he had dealt with were matters of substance. They affected the credit of the House, and the character of its work. The forms and traditions of this House, and above all when these secured adequate debate, and even lengthy discussion, were the very guarantee of the character of the work the House did. It was because it was felt that, at any rate, matters had been thoroughly thrashed out, and well debated, that it had had its distinguishing character of finality. No doubt it was tempting for a Minister to say: "I want to pass the Bill rapidly, and therefore, I will closure, closure, closure the Clauses—the whole of them from beginning to end." But if they adopted that system the result would be that the same confidence would not be felt in the finality of their legislation and a Bill thus easily passed in one year would be as easily repealed in the next. He was not content to see this House become the slave of any Government, not even of the present Government. He was not content to see it become the pliant and powerless instrument either of the dangerous dreams of anarchist adventurers, or of the sickly rapacity of decadent reactionaries. The central principle of our Constitution was that the proposals of

Ministers should be subjected to the free voice and criticism of the people. It was in this House alone that voice and that criticism could be heard. This House was the central citadel of the Constitution, and if they allowed their outworks to be undermined, then the citadel which had withstood the assaults of a race of giants might be demolished by the feeble efforts of a race of pigmies, and they themselves be stoned with the ruins of their own defences.

(3.15.) MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that he should have expected that before the House was asked to adopt such a sweeping suggestion the right hon. Gentleman would have given some argument in its favour. The few words which the right hon. Gentleman let fall were of a most disheartening character to hon. Members who had been working for 195 sittings. The right hon. Gentleman said that if his Resolutions were not passed all their labours would be wholly wasted. He really thought that that was a preposterous statement. Why did the right hon. Gentleman make the new Rules Sessional Orders if he did not intend to give the House an opportunity of trying them?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that there was no other way of proceeding under their system.

MR. LOUGH said that the proposal to make the Rules Standing Orders might be made at any time; and he would urge that it would be a most drastic proceeding to make them Standing Orders without having given the House an opportunity of testing them. The Supply Rule was invented by the right hon. Gentleman about seven years ago, and he thought it was a most disastrous invention; but for four years, in order to give it a full trial, it remained a Sessional Order. Surely, if the right hon. Gentleman thought it right to allow that interval in the case of the Supply Rule, the House should be given an opportunity of testing the Rules now before the House, before they were made Standing Orders. The right hon. Gentleman asked the House, without any explanation, to do away with six Standing Orders, two of which had been in existence for forty years, and the others from ten to fourteen years. He thought that was a case of throwing away the dirty water before getting in the clean. At least they might keep the old Orders until they were quite sure that they had got something better in their place. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken made a most excellent suggestion—viz., that the matter should be referred to a Committee. He would ask the Prime Minister whether he would consider that suggestion, which was a most moderate one, and which would not give the right hon. Gentleman a fall. He had no doubt that the House would receive from such a deliberative body Resolutions which would be far better than those now proposed. The point he wished to take was that in the present state of the House and at the present time of the session, it was monstrous that they should be asked to establish new Standing Orders. The House today was one of the thinnest they had had during the session; one important section, namely, the Irish Members, who were deeply interested in all the Standing Orders, was absent. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Why?"] It did not matter why. Why were not the supporters of the Government present? It was because they were worn out and exhausted by their prolonged labours. Very few possessed the iron constitutions that would enable them to attend nearly 200 sittings in one year. Although one important section of the House was absent, it was proposed to make these crude and far-reaching experiments Standing Orders. It seemed to him that that would be an improper thing to do, and that more time should be allowed for the new Rules to be tried. The Prime Minister interrupted the hon. Gentleman opposite when he said that there had been no opportunity for examining the new Rules. The right hon. Gentleman said that they were adopted in May; but the session was an extraordinary session, and nothing had been normal in it. Therefore, the trial given to the new Rules was practically worthless. What really ought to be done was to postpone the consideration of the matter until March, 1904; and if the new Rules worked well during the next session, the Prime Minister would have a case for making them Standing Orders. The session was interrupted by the Coronation, by the business the Government proposed, and by the pressure they applied. Moreover, one of the Rules—that relating to private business—was adopted when the pressure of private business was over, and the House had had no experience of how it would work. Then, in reference to the Supply Rule, on every occasion on which the right hon. Gentleman brought it forward, he had opposed it, as he believed that its adoption destroyed the efficiency of the control of the House over Supply. He had no objection to the Closure, controlled by the Minister responsible or by the Chair. He believed that the Closure was absolutely necessary for the successful conduct of debate; but the setting up of the guillotine was an entirely different thing. He believed that no business transacted in the House under the shadow of the guillotine was well transacted. For the past fortnight the House had been working under the guillotine; and would any hon. Member argue that good work had been done during that period? It was said in reference to the Supply Rule, that after all the House had twenty-one days, even with the guillotine at the end, and that no harm resulted. He held an entirely different opinion. Since the Rule came into operation the debates in Supply had been perfectly worthless. Ministers did not trouble to make replies to the points which were raised, as they knew that the guillotine remained. It would not be in order for him to refer to the inordinate growth in the national expenditure, but he believed it was closely connected with the working of the Supply Rule. He would ask the Prime Minister whether the House should not be afforded a further opportunity of testing the Rule before such a drastic change was made a Standing Order. He imagined that it was because the right hon. Gentleman was not quite clear as to the business to be brought on that he submitted his Motion.; and he would ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would not consent to the appointment of a Committee to consider the whole subject.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, and add the words, 'it is inexpedient at this period of the session, and without further experience of the Resolutions agreed to as Sessional Orders on 17th February, 11th April, 28th April, and 1st May, to consider a proposal that such Resolutions be Standing Orders of the House.' "—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'that the Resolutions dealing with' stand part of the Question."—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had been reproached by the hon. Member who moved the Amendment for not having introduced his Motion with an elaborate statement of the reasons which had induced him to make it. The reason he did not adopt the course suggested by the hon. Gentleman was that he had made a very large number of speeches on the Sessional Rules before. They had been fully discussed by the House, and he was not aware of any argument which he desired to urge which he had not had an opportunity of urging. He had not the same affection for his own speeches which the hon. Gentleman had for his; therefore, he did not see why he should weary either the House or himself by repeating a twice-told tale; and he thought it more respectful to his hon. friend and to the House to wait until he had heard the character of the attack about to be developed against the procedure the House was asked to adopt. Candidly he confessed he had heard no argument which the House had not previously heard fully developed during the many days the Sessional Rules were discussed; and, consequently, it was hardly possible for him to impart any novelty into the debate that afternoon. He wished to correct before he went further, one extraordinary mistake into which the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken seemed to have fallen. The hon. Gentleman regarded—he was about to say he affected to regard—the procedure of turning Sessional into Standing Orders as an exception to the general practice of the House. The hon. Gentleman said: "We have had six months experience; cannot you give us a little more time?" The constant practice of the House where they had passed an Order which they desired to be a Standing Order, had been to make it a Sessional Order, and then pass the consequent Resolution turning it into a Standing Order.

Mr. LOUGH said that was not the case with the Supply Rule.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked if, because in that particular case he adopted that plan, the whole of the preceding practice of the House was to be thrown on one side, and an entirely novel procedure adopted. The great revolution of the Closure which Mr. Gladstone introduced into their procedure in 1883, was passed on November 24th, in an Autumn session, and Mr. Gladstone moved that it be made into a Standing Order three days later, on the 27th. A series of new Rules, passed by Mr. W. H. Smith, were finished on March 7th, and they were made Standing Orders on the same day without division. That was the practice of the House, and he could not understand how, on the ground of precedent, any objection could be taken to the course the Government now proposed. Coming to the criticisms of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, his bitter complaint of broken pledges on the part of the Government with regard to rights of private Members——

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he had not intended to suggest that the pledge had been broken. He had intended to show, and thought he had shown, that the Rules had not worked out according to the expectations of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR accepted the hon. Gentleman's statement, and said his suggestion as to the operation of the Rules on the rights of private Members was wholly mistaken. The Rules, as regarded the rights of private Members, had had little time to work, because of the late date at which they had come into operation. The Rule was intended to secure for private Members two nights a week before Easter, one night between Easter and Whitsuntide, all Fridays to Whitsuntide, and two Fridays after that date. That was the plan of the Rule. As it only came into operation on May 5th, it was obvious that even if the Government had wished to rob private Members they could not do so. So far as the Rule had been tried, it had worked out as intended; and private Members had had their rights preserved, as he hoped they would have in the future. Nothing that had yet occurred had shaken his conviction that the Government had, in this Rule, as regards private Members' rights replaced illusory privileges by rights which were smaller nominally in extent, but were much more likely to be preserved. As to the suggestion that private Members' rights should revive after Michaelmas, such a plan never occurred to anybody out of an asylum. The necessity of an Autumn session was a cruel and hard one; it was a necessity which no Government would be coerced into except by special circumstances, and when a Government did ask the House to come together in the Autumn it was not for the purpose of hearing abstract Resolutions discussed by private Members two nights in a week, but for the purpose of absolutely necessary Government business. He thought it plausible that the Government should be required to say what they were going to do, and to give some general idea as to the general necessity on which they justified imposing additional labour upon the House after Michaelmas, and therefore the word had been introduced when it was proposed as an Amendment; but he absolutely denied that it was ever contemplated that the plan in operation before Easter should revive in an Autumn session, so as to have two nights then for abstract discussions and Fridays for private Members' Bills. Then the hon. Member for King's Lynn objected to the Rule dealing with Private Bill legislation, and said how shocking it was to be asked to make this Rule permanent before the Committee appointed to consider Private Bill legislation had reported. But he did not remind the House that the Rule was deliberately excluded from the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said the Prime Minister was overlooking an Amendment to the Resolution appointing the Committee—an Amendment the right hon. Gentleman had himself accepted.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR maintained that even in the amended form no difference was made to his contention. The Committee were to consider the method of dealing with Private Bill Legislation subject to this change. The next Rule to which his hon. friend objected was the Rule dealing with a quorum, and there he was on ground where he always enjoyed himself. He was discussing the Long Parliament, and what he regarded as the true constitutional doctrine by which this House ought to regulate its behaviour; and one of his objections, he understood, was that the Rule embodied in a concrete form the old practice of the House that forty was a quorum, so that if there were not forty present the House could not vote. Surely a precedent that went back 262 years to the Long Parliament ought to satisfy his hon. friend and other opponents on the ground of ancient usage. His hon. friend insisted on having an absolute majority. That would be a change indeed, and if seriously desired would amply justify the wish of any hon. Member that not too much business should be accomplished. In arguing that the Rule did not encourage attendance before ten, the hon. Member made a great point of one division in which the Government was only in a majority of seventeen. The average of Members voting in divisions, taken in the three-quarters of an hour after nine o'clock during the Autumn session, was 200, therefore there was experimental proof that the Rule did not empty the House between nine and ten o'clock, and there was no reason why an excellent Rule should not become part of the machinery of debate. No doubt it was perfectly true, as the hon. Gentleman pointed out, that the practice of amending Rules bit by bit as necessity arose led to a collection of *dicta* extremely difficult to comprehend, and, with advantage, the Rules might be redrafted, and the task of redrafting them might with advantage be left to a Committee. But he went much further than his hon. friend proposed to go, because one of the new Rules which he had proposed, when passed, would greatly consolidate the power of the House. He thought the redrafting of the Rules might very well be referred to a Committee, on much the same conditions as he had proposed in the new Rule for Consolidation Bills. It was no use sending the Rules to a Committee if they were to be considered Clause by Clause as they came back to the House. The various Rules must be run into a coherent mould and the House must deliberately abstain from redrafting the details or discussing the principles of its own Standing Orders. He understood his hon. friend to object to that. All he could say was that as long as he objected he would never see the end attained that he desired. No Government were going to occupy the whole session, not in altering the substance or improving the details of the Rules, but merely in redrafting them. If they were going to send the Rules to a Committee, and then, when the Rules came back, have the right to discuss the principle and language of every Rule, they would have to spend not merely an ordinary session, but also an Autumn session over the business.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked whether, if it was found necessary to make some minute change which did not affect the general consolidation, the right hon. Gentleman would allow the Committee to report that matter separately, so that it could be discussed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman had probably missed what he said, viz., that the kind of machinery that he had proposed for Consolidation Bills might with advantage be used for redrafting the Rules of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would explain that machinery.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought Mr. Speaker might have something to say to that.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must say that this is opening up an entirely new question, and it would offer a wide field of argument, which is not covered by the present Motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had been betrayed into mentioning the point, without in the least intending to develop it, by some observations of his hon. friend. He gladly dropped the subject, and was sorry he had gone so far. In conclusion, he would make one practical observation. The House could not avoid passing these Rules without plunging its whole system of Standing Orders for the next session into hopeless confusion, and the session would have to be spent in trying to clean up the mess. That was neither business nor commonsense. His hon. friend was anxious for the rights of private Members. But if these Rules were dropped, the House would have to meet early next year and spend next session as it had spent this, during which time private Members would have no rights whatever except on Wednesdays. He really did not think the matter required argument. The House had spent a very large amount of important Parliamentary time in discussing and rediscussing with, as he thought, unnecessary minuteness, these provisions. He asked the House not to let all that trouble be absolutely wasted, but to embody the changes in the constitution of the House. In his opinion the changes had worked extremely well. Heavy as had been the labour thrown on the House, it would have been much heavier without these Rules. He would not say a word as to the general merits of the whole scheme of the Government, but he did say that not to pass these five new Standing Orders would be to throw upon Parliament next session an absolutely unnecessary burden of new work, or rather, of old work revived and to be re-done—a proceeding which would be utterly unworthy of the traditions of a business-like Assembly.

(3.50.) MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) contended that the complaint that the House had not had sufficient experience of the working of the new Rules was a legitimate criticism now to make. The order with regard to opposed private business admittedly dealt with a most important matter. If the Committee, about the reference to which the Prime Minister and the hon. Member for King's Lynn had a slight controversy, was to consider the condition of private business, subject to this change, it could not very well help considering the change itself. It could not report that the change was a bad one, but it could find that private business worked extremely badly subject to the change, which came to much the same thing. During the autumn sittings, with the exception of the question of the "Tubes," the House had had no opposed private business of importance to deal with. That was partly due to the fact that the time fixed for private business was an inconvenient one to Parliamentary agents and others. He agreed that the House ought not to be controlled by those agents, but it would be a serious matter if private business were driven upstairs outside the purview of the House and conducted entirely in Committee, without the House having the opportunity of reviewing questions which, though private in form were public in character. Railway and County Council Bills dealt with questions of great public importance, which ought to be carefully considered by the House itself, but he believed that this new Rule wouldt end to discourage that sort of business from coming before the House at all. At any rate, sufficient time had not yet elapsed to show whether or not that would be its effect. He based his claim not on precedent, but on commonsense. Then as to the quorum, he thought the Rule regarding that matter ought not yet to be made a Standing Order. The quorum was an extremely low one. He did not advocate the foreign quorums, but other Assemblies certainly had in their high quorums a check against rash and reckless legislation, which the House of Commons did not possess. The whole of this quorum question really turned on the dinner-hour interval, and that had not yet been properly tested.

*MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that the question of the dinner-hour interval did not arise on the Resolution before the House.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) asked whether, inasmuch as the Motion proposed to repeal Standing Orders 4 to 8, the hon. Member would not be in order in arguing in favour of those Standing Orders as against the new proposals.

*MR. SPEAKER: No. The Motion proposes to repeal certain Standing

Orders on the ground that they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders which the House has voted. It is the same as with the repeal schedules in a Bill, upon which you may discuss whether or not the enactments proposed to be repealed are really inconsistent with the new Bill, but you cannot again discuss the merits of the Bill itself.

Mr. VICARY GIBBS said he had no intention of developing the point; he desired to confine himself to saying that the quorum rule was framed in order to give Members a dinner interval, and the two questions really stood or fell together as far as the work of the House was concerned. He looked upon this Rule as the least considered, worst drafted, and most undesirable of all, and therefore strongly hoped the Prime Minister would see his way to except it from the Motion. Where there was not a sufficient quorum present, then there could be no discussion, because the numbers present were insufficient and did not fairly represent the House. What were they going to do with these Rules? They might commence with a Bill like the Wild Birds Preservation Bill, discuss it for twenty minutes, and then have a division. Then they might find that they had not sufficient numbers. Then they might turn to another Bill, discuss it for twenty minutes, and again find that they had not enough Members present to deal with it. Then they might fly to the Home Rule Bill and discuss it at their leisure. This was no distortion or twisting of the words of this Standing Order. Then there was the Business in Supply Rule, which he protested against when it was introduced. He regretted that at the end of one of the most punishing sessions which they had ever gone through a proposal of this kind should be introduced.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said his right hon. friend had given them his reasons for choosing this day — which he admitted was probably the only available day this session — for inviting the House to turn these Sessional Orders into Standing Orders. Some hon. Members might have it in their recollection that when the First Lord of the Treasury brought foward his scheme for the revision of the Rules he moved an Amendment that the whole matter should be referred to a Select Committee. They would then have had an opportunity of discussing all these points which in themselves might apparently be trivial, yet when considered in the mass were quite necessary for the good working of the business of the House of Commons and the maintenance of the rights of hon. Members of the House. At that time he contended that before the House proceeded to alter the Rules it should have the advantage of the experience of some of the most important Members of the House. His Amendment was attacked and derided as being entirely out of the question, but he thought events had shown that not much time would have been lost, and a good deal of heat and misunderstanding would have been saved if that particular course had been followed. They had already spent a great many days over these Rules, and he sympathised and also associated himself with the right hon. Gentleman in the wish that the House should not be called upon again unnecessarily to go over exactly the same ground in regard to these particular Rules as they went over before, but he did not imagine that that would be likely to occur in any case. He would quote as a reason this long and complicated Sessional Order with regard to Supply, which was very much opposed by some hon. Members, and, no doubt, approved of by others. It had been renewed session after session to the best of his recollection, and no very long time had been required by the House in discussing it. Speeches were made and perhaps a division might have been taken, but no great amount of time had been wasted in the renewal of this Standing Order. How did they stand? These Rules, the merits of which he was not now going to discuss, were really vital in their effect upon the rights of private Members, and in regard to the rights of hon. Members at large. He should have thought that it would at least have been of great advantage and assistance to the House if they could have had a much longer experience of the working of these Rules than they had had. This had been altogether an exceptional session. These Rules were not passed until that portion of the session, which was particularly the private Members' part, had gone, and now they were asked to bind themselves by these Rules for all time. He should have thought that there were two alternatives, one of which might have been adopted—one was that they should trust the House to renew these Rules at the beginning of the next session; and the other alternative was to give the House an easy opportunity of reviewing the step it was now asked to take. Would it not be possible to pass these Rules for a period of one or two years for the express purpose of giving the House an opportunity of judging as to their effect. As regarded the disposition of the time of private Members, they had practically had no experience at all of the Rule. The apportionment of the time for the real discussion of private Bills was now, in certain cases, left to the Chairman of Committees. They did not know yet how that arrangement would work, for the Rule had very seldom come into operation. If he might say so, with all due respect to the Chairman, he thought it was rather a risky Rule. The additional fact had been disclosed in the course of this short debate that there was a Committee sitting not upon this Rule itself, because it was unnecessary to make the Rule the basis of the inquiry, but that Committee might throw a great deal of light upon the question which might induce the House to alter or modify the Rule itself. They had not received the report of the Committee yet, and it was no answer to say that the Committee was appointed to consider the question subject to the provisions of that Rule, because the result of their inquiry must serve to guide the House with regard to the propriety of the Rule. As for the quorum, no one could say that the hour between nine and ten o'clock was a satisfactory element in their day's work just now. He had seen Members talking with great prolixity during that time with some object which was left for them to discover. He had seen even the Chancellor of the Exchequer engaged in this operation of making a very much more lengthy speech than was usually expected from him, with a strange habit of always casting his eye up to the clock. The picture which had been drawn by some hon. Members of the series of divisions which might be taken, and the rapid passing in consequence of the smallness of the numbers to some fresh subject, did not redound either to the credit or to the practical efficiency of the House. He was not going to enter into the question of the dinner hour, but undoubtedly the main object of this new arrangement as to a quorum was to provide sufficient elbow room and elasticity for those who dined. It was one of his great objections to many of these Rules that they regarded the convenience and comfort of Members rather than the public services. This Rule might be one of those instances. He would now pass on to the Rule in regard to Supply. He admitted that in regard of this Rule they had had a good deal of experience, but yet, for his own part, he shrank from making it a permanent Order. His great objection to the Rule as it stood was not so much the guillotine, or its ludicrous closing of Supply, but it was the effect of the Rule upon the whole proceedings of Supply. From the beginning to the end of the session, the Government of the day—he did not say the present Government in particular but any Government — did not care two straws what the time of the House was occupied upon, for each Minister knew that when his vote was put down he had only to sit on the Bench opposite, look wise, and stand the racket as well, because he knew the thing would come to an end at some fixed time or other. Whether the discussion was upon one point in his administration or another, if the day was given to the discussion, whether it was the Board of Trade or the Home Office Vote, at the end of the discussion the Minister could shut up his box with satisfaction and go away, knowing that for the next twelve months he had a clean sheet. He did not think that such a Rule conduced to the efficient working of the Committee of Supply. The Government was considered to be entitled to say "Here are your 23 or 25 days for Supply and do what you like with them. What does it matter to us? Some hon. Members wish to talk about one thing and some about another — settle it amongst yourselves. What does it matter to the Government? We are here to answer your questions and to make speeches in reply. That is our function and you may do what you like." But that was not the proper way to conduct the Supply business of the House of Commons, and it was fatal to any effective criticism on the part of hon. Members of the House. That was the main objection he had to the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. Under the old practice, which he admitted was open to the objection that nobody ever knew what business was coming on, at all events the Government knew that if there was an awkward question in connection with a certain Department sooner or later they must face it. But under the new system they might never face it, because when the vote for that Department came on the time might be taken up—possibly by some of the supporters of the Government—discussing some other item, and the real thing of which they were afraid never came before the House. But the two days had been spent, and away went the Minister singing, not *coram latrone*, but singing because he was free from the ordeal which, under the order of procedure, he would have to pass through. That was a very serious objection to the whole system, and it was on that ground mainly that he was averse from making this a permanent Standing Order. He agreed with the criticisms of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, but the substantial point was that there had not been experience sufficient to justify the making of these Orders permanent. It was desirable that the House should have some further opportunity, either by a Committee, after further experience, or by renewing the Rules for one or two sessions experimentally, of knowing better what it was doing before they were permanently adopted.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) approved of the suggestion that a limited time should be assigned, say during next session, for the House to have an opportunity of testing the merits or demerits of these new proposals, instead of establishing them as Standing Orders now. There could be no doubt that the present position of the House with regard to these Rules was highly inconvenient and anomalous. Many hon. Members did not know what Rules were in force and what were not. If they were asked now to terminate the suspense and finally close the chapter, he could understand it, but they were told that some of the Rules dealing with most important parts of the subject were to stand over *sine die*, and not even an attempt made to discuss or consider them during the present session of Parliament. It was desirable that the House should retain an open mind with regard to the Rules as a whole, before those now under consideration were established as Standing Orders. Some of the Rules were in what might be called a mutilated condition, being partly in operation and partly in suspense. There were several of the Rules which could only be said to be of a tentative character until they were completed by the entire passage of the whole scheme. It appeared to be much more reasonable that the House should have an opportunity of seeing how the Rules worked, and that it should not be called upon to convert into Standing Orders experimental suggestions which even the authors of them were doubtful how they would work. He trusted that the House would not be in a hurry in respect of this question.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he agreed with most of the criticisms made by the hon. Member for King's Lynn in the peech in which he moved the Amendment. The real question which the House had now to consider was whether these Sessiona Orders ought or ought not to be made Standing Orders. He contended that the burden of proof of that proposition lay upon the Government, and he should like to know whether any member of the Government could quote any precedent for converting Sessional Orders of this character, passed under the circumstances in which these became Orders, into Standing Orders at the end of a session. The earliest of these orders came into operation on 11th April, and the latest on 1st May, and it appeared to him to be quite against the ordinary course of business in this House to attempt to convert the Sessional Orders, passed after the crucial stage of the session had passed, into Standing Orders, especially when they related to what might be called the fundamental Rules of Procedure of the House. He asked the House to consider the arguments which might well be urged against the present proposition were not sufficient either to induce the Government to withdraw the motion, or, at any rate, to limit the application of the Motion to one other session, and take the course of appointing a Committee to consider the whole matter. The first argument on which he based his support of the

Amendment was their want of experience of the new Orders. The first of these Sessional Orders gave Mr. Speaker power, if he thought necessary, to adjourn the House without Question put, or to suspend a sitting for a time to be named by him. He was not indisposed to enlarge the powers of Mr. Speaker in case of disturbance arising in the House, but he should like to remind hon. Members that there had been times in the history of the House when Mr. Speaker attempted to leave the Chair against its will, and in obedience to higher orders. He did not wish to go back to the times when the constitutional relations between the Crown and the Houses of Parliament were different from what they were now, but still he thought they ought to be very wary before they parted with their time-honoured privileges by giving, notwithstanding the confidence they might have in any occupant of the Chair, undue power to Mr. Speaker to adjourn the House. He pointed out that the power of adjourning an ordinary sitting was a very different power from that of adjourning the House. He did not believe this Sessional Order had had any adequate discussion. Certainly there had been no experience of its application, and in the interest of the privileges of this House he protested against so grave an alteration as would be involved in making this Order a Standing Order. He would not enlarge upon their want of experience. It was practically admitted by the Prime Minister that these five Orders, passed in what would be mid-session in an ordinary session, had not really been tested from day to day and from week to week. His second argument against making these Sessional Orders Standing Orders was that they would add gravely to the uncertainty of their Rules in regard to the conduct of Parliamentary business. If these were made Standing Orders in the present condition in which the Standing Orders were left as the result of the Resolutions passed in the earlier part of the session, it would be impossible for any Member to ascertain what was the law in regard to the conduct of Parliamentary business. Referring to the rule on "Priority of Business," he said that as it at present stood it might deprive private Members of the time which, he understood from the declarations of the Prime Minister, it was intended they should have. The Rule said—

> "That unless the House otherwise direct—Government Business shall have precedence at every Sitting except the Evening Sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday, and the Sitting on Friday. At the Evening Sittings of Tuesday and Wednesday Notices of Motion and Public Bills, other than Government Bills, shall have precedence of Government Business."

He understood from the declaration made by the Prime Minister that the evening Sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday were not to be interfered with in any way.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said this was an arrangement come to and embodied in the Rule.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said it was an arrangement forced upon the House. He submitted that these Sessional Orders should not at the present time be converted into Standing Orders. The difficulty of carrying on the business of the House could not be efficiently met by merely reducing the rights of private Members. More drastic measures were necessary. He was not referring to the desirability of devolving private business by some such system as that which applied to Scotland, or the devolving of other business on local bodies in a county or groups of counties; but he did not think the Government in the course they were taking were going the right way to meet what might be called the breakdown of Parliamentary business. In dealing with questions of Supply, why should not the principle of Grand Committees be applied? Why should not the Navy and Army Estimates be sent to a Grand Committee upstairs, and only the Report stage dealt with on the floor of the House? He could not properly go into these matters at present, but in view of all the circumstances he could not vote for making the Sessional Orders Standing Orders.

(4.35.) MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) said he quite agreed with the Prime Minister that there was very little novelty about this discussion, so much time having been devoted to the subject in the early part of the session. No wonder they were here on the 1st of December, looking to the amount of time that had been spent in the discussion of these Rules. There was work enough for a session if only the Rules and one small Bill had been taken. The Prime Minister told them that the House should not waste all the time it had spent by discussing the Rules again next Session. But it was not on the Rules they were discussing today that so much time had been spent. It was on the Rules which they could not discuss and which were not on the Paper that time was spent. He ventured to think the House would find out that there were Rules passed hurriedly which would have to be changed. There were gentlemen on the Treasury Bench who took part in passing the new Rules who were not quite so comfortable now when they came to the working of them. He did not wish to go through the objections he took on a former occasion to the Rules. He thought the House must logically turn these Rules into Standing Orders, although personally he should vote against them. The power given to Mr. Speaker to adjourn the House had rather a foreign flavour. In this House Mr. Speaker had the almost entire confidence of Members, whereas in certain foreign Assemblies the Chairman was the one party who was not considered at all. This Rule was also dangerous, because, as had been pointed out before, an arrangement could be made to create scenes of disorder with the view of avoiding a division which would not be satisfactory to those in possession of the House at the time. He thought the Rule as to "Priority of Business" was most satisfactory. The axis on which the whole of the Rule rotated was the word "Easter." Easter was a movable feast, and therefore it was not a proper time on which to base the working of the Rule from year to year. Some years it might be advantageous to private Members, and other years it would not be. When the question of the Rules relating to private business was under discussion, they were told that the whole matter would be referred to a Committee, and certainly it was understood that the House would have an opportunity of reviewing the Report of the Committee before any steps were taken to make the Sessional Orders Standing Orders of the House. They had not a Report from that Committee, and yet they were asked to make these Rules Standing Orders. What they asked to do now might or might not be satisfactory, but at the present moment they had not got information on the subject. He objected very strongly to the collective closure of Supply. In his opinion it was not so much the old Rules that were at fault as the men who used them. Let Ministers adapt themselves and the business of the House to the Rules, as many better men had done before them. He should vote against the Motion as a Conservative who wished to see the honour and dignity of the House maintained. This was not to be done by meddling and tinkering with the Rules.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said that it was an important question which had been raised today, and as he was the only Member from Ireland on either side of the House who had taken part in the debate, he felt it was his bounden duty to enter his protest in behalf of that portion of the United Kingdom against these rules being made Standing Orders, and so stereotyped. The Motion had been sprung upon the House because in the exigencies of the Education Bill, which did not affect Ireland or Scotland, there happened to be a *dies non*, and it was convenient to the Government to bring forward this important question. He doubted very much whether there were now forty Members present, but he was not going to make a point of that. He would not discuss the different Rules in detail, but he was rather astonished at what appeared to him to be the only argument advanced by the First Lord of the Treasury in justification of his position, namely, that he ought to have moved to make these new Rules Standing Orders in April and May last when they became Sessional Orders. That was no answer to the very able arguments of the hon. Member for King's Lynn. He could understand the right hon. Gentleman's argument if the proposal to make the Rules Standing Orders had been made when the whole discussion was fresh in the minds of Members, but the arguments which were formerly stated had probably escaped their recollection. The very first of the Sessional Orders struck at the root of the independence of the House of Commons. It was repugnant to one's preconceived notions of the independence of the House of Commons that the power of adjourning the House in the way proposed should be conferred on the Speaker, no matter how eminent he might be, and no matter how fully, as in the present case, he might enjoy the confidence of both sides of the House. That should not be made a Standing Order without the utmost deliberation. One of the Rules to which he wished particularly to call their attention was that about Supply. Ireland had just ground to complain of the way she had been treated by this country with regard to financial relations. A Committee of this House had found that Ireland had been overtaxed to the extent of between two and a half and three millions a year. Every new tax that was imposed created a new injustice. Having regard to the finding of that Committee, this new Order for closuring Supply would operate most unjustly to Ireland. This session only three days were allotted to the Irish Estimates. The result was that the guillotine fell upon a large number of Irish Votes without Ireland being able to raise her voice in protest against the injustices inflicted upon her. He objected to that Rule being made a Standing Order in the absence of every Irish Member but himself. If the Irish Members were present, they would oppose it. He strongly deprecated this attempt on the part of the Government to snatch the passage of those Standing Orders in an almost deserted House.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) said he considered the Government perfectly justified in bringing forward this proposal. With regard to the grievances of private Members, complaints were frequently made of the time of private Members being taken by the Government. But it seemed to him that the question of Government should be regarded as a whole, and he thought that the parochial questions which were brought forward by private Members would be more appropriately discussed in such a tribunal as the Grand Committee, leaving the time of the House entirely for the consideration of great Imperial matters. With regard to the first of the Rules proposed to be stereotyped as Standing Orders the power of the Speaker to adjourn the House, on appropriate occasion—although it was adopted from the practice of foreign Parliaments, it was a very necessary power, and he heartily supported it as he should the whole of them with one exception. The one Rule to which he objected was the Supply Rule, and although he was going to support the Government on the whole measure, he hoped this point would receive their particular attention at some other time. Supply ought not to be allowed to drag on to the end of the session and then be voted *en bloc.* The constitutional function of the House was to provide Supplies for the carrying on of the business of the country. It was its duty to discuss every one of these Votes, to inquire how it was proposed to spend the money, and to reject it if necessary; but that duty it could not discharge if numbers of the Votes were carried *en bloc* at the end of the session. Apart from that, he thought the new Rules were wise and salutary.

MR. BRYCE admitted the difficulty of keeping the Rules as they now were, but he thought that it was far better to continue the temporary arrangement for some time longer than for the House to commit themselves irrevocably to the Rules. He therefore hoped that they would be carried over to next session, in order to give hon. Members an opportunity of reconsidering their merits. There was one group of Rules in which the House certainly required more experience—namely, those affecting the sittings of the House. He believed the Rule fixing the sitting of the House at 2 o'clock was disapproved of on both sides of the House. Many Members were debarred from attending before 4 o'clock, and it was impossible for a Minister to attend to his Departmental work properly when he had to be in the House at 2 o'clock. He protested against its being supposed that the House generally acquiesced in that arrangement, and he hoped the House would take the earliest opportunity of reconsidering it.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said this was a very unsatisfactory method of dealing with the Rules, as was shown by the fact that for some hours less than thirty Members had been present, and four out of every five who had spoken upon them from the Unionist side were against making them Standing Orders. He supposed, however, it was useless to make any further appeal to the Government upon the subject. He protested against the Rules being made permanent, and would suggest that the Government should adopt the plan of the Leader of the Opposition, and continue them as temporary Rules until January, 1904, and so give the House a further opportunity of reconsidering them.

*MR. R. PIERPOINT (Warrington) said he entirely approved of what had been said by the Leader of the Opposition. His desire that more time should be given for the consideration of these Rules was very much strengthened by arguing by analogy from the new Rules which had already been made Standing Orders, which had in many respects proved inconvenient. He could not but think that the only Conservative in this matter sitting on the Front Benches was the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition.

(5.12.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 144; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 601.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDix'n
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, HnG, R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
HamiltonRtHnLordG. (Midd'x
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Howard, John(Kent, Faversh'm
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawson, John Grant
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, RtHn. SirWilliamH.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Crombie, John William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lloyd-George, David
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pierpoint, Robert
Price, Robert John
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. Lough.

(5.23.) MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.), in moving to omit from the Motion the proposed new Standing Order giving Mr. Speaker power to adjourn the House or suspend the sitting, if in the interests of order he thinks it desirable so to do, said he approached the question with the most profound respect for the dignity of the Chair, and with an utter lack of sympathy with any disorder, grave or trivial, that might occur in the House. The House of Commons was not only a Chamber of Legislature, it was also the forum of national and public debate; and, if order were Heaven's first law, it was certainly the first condition of the existence of the House of Commons. It was unfortunately true that in the past scenes of disorder had arisen, and might arise in future, and he concurred in the view that Mr. Speaker's responsibility in the matter ought not to be made greater unless at the same time his powers were increased. But it was none the less necessary for the House to be careful lest it went too far. He had a general as well as a particular objection to the proposal to make this Rule a Standing Order. The general objection was that since this Sessional Order was passed there had happily been no occasion on which it had been necessary to put it into operation, so that it had not been put to the test of experiment. The particular objection was not so much to the whole of the Sessional Order as a part, but by the Rules of the House he was compelled to move the omission of the whole. He took no exception to the proposal that Mr. Speaker should be permanently empowered to suspend the sitting on grave disorder arising. That was a power which resided in all Presidents or Chairmen of foreign Assemblies, and which ought to reside in the Speaker of the House of Commons. He drew a distinction, however, between suspending the sitting and adjourning the House. For Mr. Speaker to suspend the sitting and thus give heated passions an opportunity to cool was one thing, but for Mr. Speaker to have within his own power the prerogative of adjourning the House was one of much wider import. At present the one power which could adjourn the House was the House itself, and he hesitated to agree to the proposal now made. A further objection was that the power, if given, would under certain circumstances devolve also upon not only the Chairman of Committees but also the Deputy Chairman, and hitherto a notable distinction had always been drawn between the occupant of the Chair and the Chairman of Committees. For these reasons he asked the House to hesitate before it yielded up its historic right and privilege of determining when its sittings should come to an end. He submitted that the power to suspend the sitting would be sufficient for all occasions that were likely to arise, and therefore moved the Amendment standing in his name.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.), in seconding the Amendment, said that this was another illustration of the extreme inconvenience of the rapidity with which these Rules had been rushed through the House without due inquiry. On a former occasion the Leader of the Opposition made out a strong case for a Committee to inquire as to the probable effect of these and other proposals. Before that Committee, Mr. Speaker and his illustrious predecessor, some of the most experienced Members of the House and the Clerks at the Table, would have placed their views, and it would have been interesting to see what defence the Government made for this proposal. It was rather extraordinary that when this, one of the most important of the proposed changes, was under consideration, the Prime Minister should not be present to reply to arguments which had been advanced. But it was all on a piece with the light-hearted and irresponsible way in which the Government had entered upon this path of change. To tamper with the ancient Rules and privileges of the House was a most serious matter; they had had far too short a period for discussion, and now, with all respect to the hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench, they were to have an entirely unauthoritative reply. To give Mr. Speaker—for whom he had the greatest respect—the right to initiate anything in the House was a grave constitutional change. Hitherto Mr. Speaker had been the servant of the House, having simply to interpret the wish of the House, but now he was to be put in the invidious position of having to initiate or regulate the business of the House himself. That was a power which might eventually lead to a grave infringement of the rights and privileges of the House of Commons, and therefore he earnestly supported the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words, 'the power of the Speaker to adjourn the House or suspend the Sitting.'"—(*Mr. Yoxall.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GRANT LAWSON said he hoped it would be a long time before they had any experience of the working of this Rule. There had been, however, experience of disorder arising in Committee, and those who recollected the incident in 1893 would recognise the advantage of a brief interval, such as the sending for the Speaker then afforded, for the calming of excited tempers. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment admitted this, his objection being mainly directed to the power of adjournment. But supposing a scene of disorder arose late at night, it would be most unnatural for the Speaker to suspend the sitting, resuming it in the early morning. As a Sessional Order the question had been debated at considerable length, and the Order was adopted by a large majority of this House and by a majority of hon. Members opposite, and the whole of the Front Opposition Bench voted in favour of this proposal as a Sessional Order. It was now proposed as the permanent addition to the Orders of this House, and the question had been discussed not as a temporary expedient but as a permanent institution.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that the hon. Gentleman opposite, who had spoken on behalf of the Government, after admitting that these scenes were not likely to take place, proceeded to argue that it was necessary to give these great powers to Mr. Speaker, and allow him to have the power to decide what was grave disorder and what would justify him in adjourning the House. Before a great constitutional innovation of this kind was imposed some convincing reason ought to be given by the Government. He thought it was convenient, having regard to the position of those who presided over modern representative assemblies, that Mr. Speaker should have some power, as in Continental Parliaments, of suspending a sitting. But there was a great difference between adjourning the House without Question put and allowing the Speaker to suspend the sitting to a time named by him. The hon. Gentleman opposite had referred to a case in which the Chairman of Committees called in Mr. Speaker Peel, with the result that the excitement and disorder on that occasion was put an end to. The House was in a state of great excitement while the Chairman was in the Chair, but when Mr. Speaker

Peel came back the House was as quiet and orderly as possible. He did not wish to prolong the discussion, but he submitted that there was a great distinction between the power of adjourning the House without Question put and the power of suspending the sitting to a time to be named by Mr. Speaker.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER thought the reasons given by the hon. Member for Thirsk appeared to tell exactly against his argument. The hon. Member had spoken of the disorder which occurred in 1893, but that disturbance was stopped by the appearance of Mr. Speaker Peel in the House. It seemed to him that if tumult did arise, the influence and the great position of Mr. Speaker was the best way of stopping a disturbance that could be imagined. The precedent quoted of Mr. Speaker Peel confirmed him in his view that the very last thing they ought to invite their presiding officer to do was to abdicate his position and run away when his presence and authority was most needed.

(5.48.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 149 ; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 602.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHn GeraldW (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bigwood, James
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, MajEvans (T'rH'mlets
Gore, HnG. R.C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir EW (B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hobhouse, RtHnH (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Johnstone, Heywood
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, RtHn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, DavidJ. Walthamst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Percy, Earl
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn.M.W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, RtHn. Sir William H.

Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-shire
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Lambert, George
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Brynmor Jones.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said the reason which induced him to move the Amendment standing in his name was perfectly obvious after the discussion that had taken place on the words of the general Resolution proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. The Rule of the House with regard to the time of private Members as it had existed was too well known to render it necessary for him to explain in detail what the rights of unofficial Members were, and the Sessional Order now under discussion indirectly was also well known. His objection to its being made a Standing Order was that the Rule itself did not add to, but diminished, the rights of private Members. He did not think the proposal to give private Members two evening sittings was at all equivalent to the whole day which they had under the old Rule of the House. If a Member was successful in the ballot, and desired to raise a question of great public interest, it was clear it would be much more to the advantage of everybody that he should be able to raise it at an early hour rather than at nine o'clock. At nine o'clock it was difficult to get a quorum, but it was quite easy to do so at the commencement of the business of the House. But even if he had no difficulty in obtaining a quorum at nine o'clock, there was only three hours in which to discuss a matter of great public interest, which might be a matter of great interest to the House, even though the Government were not prepared at that moment to take it up. It was for these reasons that he desired to move the Amendment standing in his name. He begged to move.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said it was most important, before private Members gave up the power they possessed in the House, that they should hesitate and consider whether the Rule had been tried sufficiently to warrant them in making it permanent instead of temporary. They should wait until it had been tried sufficiently in practice. For these reasons, and because he considered this Sessional Order had not been sufficiently tried, he supported the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'Priority of Business.'"—(*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GRANT LAWSON said with regard to the House hesitating before making this a Standing Order, they had hesitated a long time before making it a Sessional Order. It took two and a half days and fourteen divisions to decide the matter. It had been thoroughly threshed out earlier in the session. With regard to what had been said as to the whole of Tuesday, the Tuesday Rule only applied to the nominal opportunities of private Members. It had been a very long time since private Members had had the whole of Tuesday; the Government took the morning sittings and when they did not, hon. Members' friends took the opportunity of counting out the House on the Tuesday night. He hoped after the way in which this House discussed the Rule in April hon. Members would not think it necessary to go to a division.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that, if this was so complicated, difficult, and risky a step to take as to need several days discussion, there was all the more reason why the House should have ample experience of the working of the Rule before it was made permanent.

MR. YOXALL said that first of all the Government by the arbitrament of force robbed the private Members of the Tuesdays they used to have; upon that petty larceny they had based a Sessional Order which was resisted by the House for no less than two and a half days discussion and fourteen divisions, and upon that doubly unfortunate basis it was proposed to build a permanent Order which should bind the House for all time, or at least for many years. He protested against it. There could be no doubt the centre of gravity for legislation was shifting from the private Member to the Government; possibly it was shifting from the Government itself to outside opinions in the Press. The private Members, because they had consented to lose their privileges for one session in this way, were now asked to consent to their being lost altogether. He should strongly support the Amendment.

(6.10.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 147; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 603.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bigwood, James
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby (-Salop.
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert

Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon Humphrey Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Brynmor Jones and Mr. Warren.

(6.23.) Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes 61. (Division List No. 604.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir Willliam Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somerset,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Howard, John(Kent,Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasche, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt.Hn Sir William H.
Welby, Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHnC.R.(Northants
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Chas. Henry(Hull, W.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Lough and Mr. Black.

Resolved, "That the Resolutions dealing with the Power of the Speaker to adjourn the House or Suspend Sitting, Priority of Business, Business in Supply, Private Business, and Quorum of the House, be Standing Orders of the House, and that Standing Orders 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 be repealed."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Ordered, That the Standing Orders, as amended, be printed. [No. 385.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on proposed New Standing Order (Second and Third Readings) [17th February] read, and discharged.—Motion withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order for Further Consideration of Standing Order No. 21 (Order in Debate), as amended, read, and discharged.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Order for Third Reading read,

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) protested against the Third Reading of this Bill at this time, because it contained what was called the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act of 1881. No case had been made by the Government against the right to carry arms in Ireland, and he thought the time had come when the Government should be prepared to state what their policy was in this matter. Farmers required the use of the shot gun to deal with the vermin on the land, and found the utmost difficulty in obtaining permission to carry one, and it was a very serious matter to them. Ireland was told that the Government was on the eve of a new departure, and that great powers were to be given to Ireland, and if that was so why should not the Irish people have the same right to carry arms as the people of England, Scotland and Wales? He strongly protested against the Arms Act being again included in this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd March], "That the Bill be now read a second time," read.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said that a Committee was sitting at the Local Government Board with a view to making further recommendations. In these circumstances he proposed to withdraw the Bill, which would be reintroduced at a future day in an amended form.

Order discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (BILLS IN PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (TRANSFER OF POWERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

MAIL SHIPS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he did not understand that this Bill was to be taken now, and although he was prepared to discuss it if the Government persisted, he thought it ought not to be taken. He moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [21st October], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

MR. CALDWELL said he understood that this Bill was to stand over and to be taken with the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, and that neither was to be taken without notice being given to him. Of course, if the Government chose to take it in the absence of the Irish Members, with whom he had promised to communicate the day when the Government proposed to proceed with it, they might do so, but if they did he should never have any confidence in them again.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There was no understanding.

MR. CALDWELL said he understood through the usual channels that this Bill would come on between the Committee and the Report stages of the London Water Bill, and he gave that information to the Irish Party, and if his information could not be relied on the fault lay with the Government and not with him. He moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. TULLY thought it was curious that the representation of Ireland should be left to the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark. It was a sad thing for Ireland when such a thing happened. He had never thought they should find such a bird in their nest. The Bill was a similar Bill to others which had been introduced, which he had successfully blocked because they, like this, imposed serious restrictions upon the people of Ireland who were largely dependent on their rivers for "power."

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) regretted that any misunderstanding should have arisen with regard to this Bill, which, so far as he was concerned, was not intended to come into the arrangement made with regard to the Local Government Bill.

MR. CALDWELL understood that the arrangement had referred to all these Irish Bills.

Question put, and negatived.

Question again proposed.

MR. TULLY said he should like some short explanation.

MR. WYNDHAM (interposing) said he had made a long speech on this Bill when it first came up for Second Reading. No exception was taken to the Bill then, and it was not in his power to make another speech now.

MR. TULLY said there had been so many "deals" with regard to Irish business that he did not know where they were. He could not agree to the restrictions placed on the water power of Ireland by this Bill. Where he lived water power had been used for developing electric light and so forth, and the people were hampered continually in their utilising of water power by the absurd fishery laws. This Bill now brought forward increased the restrictions and prevented men of energy and enterprise from utilising it. The House really ought to have some statement as to whether this Bill would interfere with mill owners who used turbine wheels for electric lighting purposes.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said if the hon. Member had only read the Bill he would have seen that it did not affect the matters he referred to in the slightest degree.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tomorrow.

*MR. SPEAKER announced that this disposed of the Government business set down for the morning sitting. There was no effective business set down for the evening sitting, and none could be, as there was no business left over from the morning sitting. It was his duty now, therefore, to adjourn the House.

*MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Seven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CHINA (No. 3) (1902).

Correspondence respecting the evacuation of Shanghae.

TREATY SERIES (No. 15) (1902).

Additional Act modifying the Industrial Property Convention of 20th March, 1883; signed at Brussels, 14th December, 1900. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Order, dated the 28th November, 1902, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1902 (No. 2). Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at Four o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GLASGOW CORPORATION (WATER AND GENERAL) ORDER CONFIRMATION.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Glasgow Corporation (Water and General), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

GLASGOW CORPORATION (WATER AND GENERAL) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Glasgow Corporation (Water and General)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 10th December, and to be printed. [Bill 306.

PETITIONS.

DETENTION OF POOR PERSONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirkwall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.

Copies presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Cumberland, Hertford, and Wilts) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Copy presented, of an Order, dated the 28th November, 1902, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1902 (No.12) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Rules approved by the Secretary for Scotland for the reception of Pauper Lunatics into Lunatic Wards of Poorhouses [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 15, 1902).

Copy presented, of Additional Act modifying the Industrial Property Convention of 20th March, 1883. Signed at Brussels, 14th December, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CHINA (No. 3, 1902).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Evacuation of Shanghae [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Education—Equivalent Grants.

Mr. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state on what basis the payment to national school teachers known as equivalent for results was made; and whether the Commissioners of National Education applied to the Treasury to allow special consideration in cases where the application of the general principle worked out unfairly to the individual teachers; and, if so, what was the result of such application.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The payment of equivalent grants, understanding by equivalent grant the single sum paid to each teacher in 1900–1 in lieu of esults fees, and not the portion of consolidated salaries corresponding to results fees, was made, as a rule, on the basis of the average incomes of the teachers from results fees during the years immediately preceding the award of the equivalent grant. In certain cases where it was shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that the grant in lieu of results fees was not a full equivalent for such fees supplementary grants were made. The Commissioners of National Education did not apply to the Treasury to allow special consideration in individual cases.

O'Keeffe v. Walsh.

MR. MACARTNEY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the summing-up of the Lord Chief Baron in the case of O'Keeffe v. Walsh and others.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) This was a litigation between private parties. There is no precedent, so far as I am aware, for laying upon the Table of the House the charge of the presiding Judge in such a case.

Bridgerule National School.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that thirty-one children attending the national school at Bridgerule, in the parish of Holsworthy, Devonshire, were withdrawn by their Nonconformist parents from the religious teaching of that school on the 13th October, and that the Vicar compelled all the children to repeat three times after the schoolmistress the following statement, "Fifty of us want the Bible, and thirty-one do not want the Bible"; and will he say what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) My attention has been called to the matter by a minister residing in Holsworthy, on the authority of a local newspaper. The only confirmation of the newspaper statement appears to be a statement made some time afterwards to the minister by the mother of two of the children to the effect that her children had been made to repeat some such words. He did not ask her by whom the requirement was made. The vicar assures me there is "not the least shadow of truth in the charge." His denial will be communicated to the minister.

British Trawlers under Foreign Flags.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that a number of British-owned trawlers have recently been transferred to the Norwegian flag and registered at Brevig under the name of the Zodiac Steam Fishing Company, so that as foreign trawlers they can fish in the Moray Firth, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of taking some action such as will put trawlers sailing under a foreign flag on the same footing as trawlers sailing under the British flag; and will he state whether the Norwegian Government have been made aware that the Moray Firth has been closed against British trawlers for scientific research.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) There is no reason to doubt that through their delegates at the Christiania Fishery Conference, and otherwise, the Norwegian Government are fully aware of the closing of the Moray Firth against British trawlers. With regard to all the earlier part of the Question of the hon. Member I can only say that the whole question is surrounded with great difficulty; and while it is, as a matter of course, the subject of consideration, the Secretary for Scotland cannot come under any further obligation in regard to it at present.

Wireless Telegraphy for Lighthouse Communication.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can now state what progress has been made in the direction of connecting certain lighthouses and lightships with the shore by means of wireless telegraphy for life-saving purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have been anxious to make some such arrangement as that indicated in my hon. friend's Question, and I entered into negotiations for the purpose. The whole subject is, however, surrounded with difficulties, and it is impossible at the moment to perfect a scheme.

Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he is aware of the condition of the Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway Station in Londonderry; and if he will take such steps as may be necessary to compel the Railway Company to build a new station suitable to the requirements and comfort of the travelling public.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he is aware of the non-compliance of the Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway Company with the Board of Trade regulations requiring that goods wagons attached to passenger trains shall be under the control of the automatic brake; and will he have an inquiry made into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Board have no power to compel a Railway Company to carry out improvements at stations already open for traffic. As regards the running of mixed passenger and goods trains, the Board's regulations do not require that the goods wagons should be fitted with continuous brakes; but they require that if not so fitted they should be placed at the rear of the train so as not to interfere with the action of the brakes upon the passenger vehicles. I have, however, called the Railway Company's attention to the hon. Member's Questions, and have received a communication in reply, of which I shall be happy to send him a copy.

Foreign Bounties.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will give a Return showing the foreign countries which pay bounties, other than shipping bounties, directly or indirectly, on the production or export of agricultural and other products, defining the commodities on which such bounties are paid, and the rate of bounty under each heading.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) Returns showing the bounties given by foreign countries were presented to Parliament in 1895 and 1896, Commercial No. 7, 1895, and No. 2, 1896. I will make every effort to comply with my hon. friend's wish, and bring these Returns up to date, but I shall be unable to give a final answer for a day or two.

Newfoundland—Supposed Agreement between France and Great Britain.

MR. YERBURGH: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Newfoundland and other outstanding questions between France and this country have been settled upon the basis of mutual concessions; and, if so, whether he can, conveniently to the public service, state the said concessions.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) There is no truth in the statement which has appeared in the Press, and to which, no doubt, my hon. friend refers.

Parcels Post to South Africa.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): To ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the rates charged by parcels post to South Africa and the consequent expense to the troops still remaining there, he can make any reduction in these charges.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have within the last fortnight made a proposal to the Colonial Office on this subject for communication to the different Colonial Administrations concerned, which I hope may lead to a reduction in the present rates. Until I am in possession of the reply of the Colonial Governments I can do nothing further.

Newcastle West Union Labourers' Scheme

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the Local Government Board have not yet held the local inquiry into the present labourers scheme of the Newcastle West Union;

and if they will expedite matters so that the labourers may if possible obtain their plots before next spring.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Board has not yet received the scheme referred to. Upon its receipt, and when the other preliminary requirements of the Labourers Acts have been complied with, the Board will lose no time in considering the question of holding a local inquiry.

Education Bill—Poor Law Children.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is any provision in the Education Bill requiring that a local education authority should receive into the schools under their charge, without payment, children maintained by boards of guardians and either resident in a workhouse, cottage home, or scattered home, or in an institution to which they have been sent by the guardians.

(*Answered by Mr. Balfour.*) There is nothing in the Education Bill to alter the present law in regard to the matter referred to in the Question.

(2.15) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Repatriation Commissions.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he will state in how many districts of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony commissions have been appointed on which there are representatives of the local inhabitants and under the presidency of a magistrate or other official for the purpose of assisting the restoration of the people to their homes, and supplying those who, owing to war losses, are unable to provide themselves with food, shelter, and the necessary amount of seed, stock, and implements for the resumption of their normal occupations as per Clause 10 of the Articles of Peace; and further, in the event of these commissions not having been appointed, will he say what local authorities are entrusted with these duties and the administration of the free grant of £3,000,000 to the Boers.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, (Worcestershire, E.): It was intended to appoint such a Commission in each district of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. This has been done in the latter Colony, and doubtless also in the former, although the Colonial Office has not yet received information as to three of the Transvaal districts.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I ask what body is distributing the funds in the Transvaal where Commissions have not been appointed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have said we have not yet received the information.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: But "doubtless" is hardly a good enough answer for the British public. Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think it necessary to make any inquiry. The Colonial Government is quite competent to deal with this matter.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Well, I give notice that I will call attention to it as soon as possible.

South African Customs Duties—Drawbacks for Soldiers.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether, in any of the Colonies in South Africa, Customs duties are charged on imported articles, such as spirits and tobacco, used by the British Army there; if so, can he state what these duties are and since when have they been imposed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Transvaal Ordinance No. 22 of 1902 provides that, "Articles imported or taken out of bond for the sole exclusive and personal use of any member of His Majesty's Regular Forces serving on full pay in the Colony," shall be admitted free of duty. The Customs duties of the Cape Colony, Natal, and the Orange River Colony are those prescribed by the South African Customs Union, one of the provisions of which is that wine and spirits and beer for the sole use of commissioned officers of His Majesty's

Regular Forces shall be exempt from duty. Prior to the war drawbacks were given amounting to 25s. per man per annum in Cape Colony, and 35s. per man per annum in Natal in 1899. Various privileges were given by the Governments of the Cape and Natal to the troops during the war, but these have now been withdrawn, as it has been decided to revert to the system of drawbacks as from 1st October last. His Majesty's Government is in correspondence with the two Colonial Governments with regard to the amount of the drawbacks.

MR. LAMBERT: Then I understand that the drawback has not been settled?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Not the amount of it.

Navy—Destruction of Defective Ammunition.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the names of the officials responsible for the manufacture, examination, testing, and taking into stock £27,000 worth of defective ammunition which had recently to be thrown overboard from His Majesty's ships; and will he state what steps have been taken to prevent ammunition of this character from being again manufactured and passed into stock; and will he say whether the officials who are to blame in this matter are still retained in the service and in the same positions as hitherto.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The pattern of fuze which was found to be defective was adopted into the service in 1885. A new pattern was adopted in 1886. The defects which were considered to render it dangerous only appeared in 1899, and were apparently caused by prolonged rough usage. All stores of this nature are subjected to rough usage trials before they are approved for the service.

MR. WEIR complained that the right hon. Gentleman had not answered a single question as to the officials responsible for the issue of the ammunition.

Sandhurst Cadets.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can explain why, by a recent circular, the parents and guardians of Sandhurst cadets are called upon to advance to the college authorities a sum of 2s. a day for extra messing, seeing that 3s. a day is already allowed out of Army funds for messing; and why, seeing that the cadets are about 300 in number, the last-mentioned sum does not suffice for good and complete messing; also, if he can state how this sum compares with the sum paid by cadets in His Majesty's Navy.

MR. BRODRICK: If the hon. Member will be good enough to look at the circular in question he will see that the advance of 2s. a day is entirely optional, and that the items to be provided out of it cannot be held to be necessary components of good and complete messing. They include such articles as beer, mineral waters, extra jams, and tobacco.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that although the Government pay a sum of 3s. per diem for the cadets' food they have nothing between 1 p.m. and 8 p.m. except such as they provide for themselves?

MR. BRODRICK: Adequate rations are provided for 3s. a day.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there have been grave complaints as to the insufficiency of food among the cadets?

MR. BRODRICK: I am not aware of that; it has not been brought to my notice.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman also aware that the guardians and parents of these cadets, taking into account this 2s. extra per diem, pay more than a guinea a day?

[No answer was returned.]

Bread Contracts for Irish Barracks.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to state the decision of the authorities as to the subletting of the bread contract for the Victoria Barracks, Belfast, and Hollywood Barracks, County Down.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not yet in a position to give the hon. Member any information on this subject.

Pretoria Field Force Canteen.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will state whether contracts for the supply of provisions and beverages to the field force canteen at Pretoria are subject to the same regulations as prevail in the case of War Office contracts in this country; and whether it is the practice in South Africa to give all such contracts to the lowest tender.

MR. BRODRICK: These contracts are made by the authorities in South Africa, and I have no information concerning the points raised in the Question.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. LOUGH (Islington W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade under what Clause of the Brussels Convention would exporters of confectionery, preserves, and other goods containing sugar derive advantage by reduction in the duties chargeable on the admission of their manufactures by the foreign countries who had signed the Convention; and whether provision has been made for the admission of manufactures from this country on the same terms as we admit foreign confectionery and similar goods.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): British exporters of confectionery and similar goods will share in the benefits derived from Article III. of the Brussels Convention, which limits the surtax, and therefore limits the discrimination against the British exporter to the amount of the surtax. There is no provision in the Convention for equality of import duty on these goods throughout the various contracting countries.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Will there be a larger tax placed upon imports than that levied upon home producers in any of these countries?

MR. LOUGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain how this surtax which only exists in foreign countries can benefit the exporter from this country?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I did not say it did.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is there any limit at all to the surtax itself? Does the Convention deal with anything more than the difference between the import and the excise duties?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The surtax is the difference.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, by Article IV. of the Sugar Convention (Brussels), Great Britain is bound to impose upon sugars or sugared products coming to this country from British self-governing Colonies a countervailing duty equal to any bounties granted by such Colonies on the production or exportation of such sugars or sugared products; if not, will he say by what Article of the Convention the general obligation imposed by Article IV. is removed from Great Britain in respect of her self-governing colonies; and can he say whether the construction placed upon the Convention in this respect by His Majesty's Government is agreed to by the other high contracting parties to the Convention.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There is nothing in Article IV. of the Brussels Convention which imposes an obligation on the contracting Powers to penalise sugar imported from their own Colonies. Any possibility of doubt on this point is removed so far as His Majesty's Government are concerned by paragraph A (2) of the Final Protocol, which reserves in principle entire liberty of action as regards the fiscal relations between the United Kingdom and its Colonies and possessions. I am aware that this view is controverted by some of the Powers who signed the Convention, but our own attitude was made perfectly clear to the conference by repeated declarations on the part of our delegates. These are embodied in the *procès-verbaux*, in which it was stated that this country would not in any case apply a penal Clause to the self-governing Colonies. The Convention was agreed to by the Powers with full knowledge of these declarations.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: This is a very important matter. Are the *procès-verbaux* part of the protocol? And is it not the case that the protocol binds Great Britain not to give her self-governing Colonies any preference over other countries, in regard to sugars coming from them?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I believe I am correct in saying that, where any doubt exists as to the interpretation of a Clause in the protocol, reference is to be made to the *procès-verbal*. The protocol does not bind us to countervail any bounty given by the Colonies.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked where the *procès-verbal* could be obtained, as it was not contained in any published Paper.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no personal knowledge, but I have been informed that the *procès-verbal* can be seen in the library now.

MR. LOUGH: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think that the admission free by this country——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a matter of opinion. The hon. Member cannot argue the question.

Landless Cottars in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Crofters Commission in their Report on the social condition of the people of Lewis, state that, in order to provide land for the landless, cottars and squatters, the proposal to break down the remaining farms in Lewis, and take certain of the lower lying parts of the deer forests for division into individual holdings, with an assigned area of common pasture for each new township, might with advantage be adopted; and will he consider the expediency of communicating with the proprietor of the island on the subject, with a view to ascertain whether he is prepared to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission.

*THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer in the absence of my right hon. friend. The Report of the Crofters Commission to which the hon. Member refers was prepared on the special request of the Secretary for Scotland. That request was made because the Secretary for Scotland felt that, without a careful review of all the circumstances of the Lewis as they now exist, taken along with accurate knowledge of the history of the island, and how the present circumstances have been brought about, it would not be possible to settle upon a definite policy. While some action in the direction suggested by the hon. Member may not improbably be resorted to, it would not of itself be adequate to provide a remedy for the existing state of matters. It is not, therefore, possible at present to come under any other obligation in regard to this or any other suggestion or proposal contained in the Report than to state that the Secretary for Scotland is considering the whole circumstances as disclosed, and the suggestions offered in the Report, and will announce in due course the conclusions arrived at.

Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that, owing to the insufficiency of the number of cruisers placed at the disposal of the Scottish Fishery Board, only one of the four convictions of illegal trawling off Tiumpan Head, Broad Bay, Island of Lewis, since the 1st January last was secured through the action of a Fishery Board cruiser; and will he consider the expediency of applying to the Treasury for additional funds to be placed on the Fishery Board Estimates for the ensuing year with a view to the acquisition of another cruiser for the protection of the interests of the line fishermen from illegal trawlers.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Secretary for Scotland does not, under present circumstances, propose to apply to the Treasury for additional funds for this purpose.

Armagh Telegraph Staff.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he can state why no local Roman Catholic has ever been appointed on the postal telegraph staff in Armagh City, although 50 per cent. of the population are Roman Catholics; and what steps will be taken to remove the dissatisfaction existing in Armagh as to this matter.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I know nothing of the religious belief of the Post Office staff either at Armagh or elsewhere, and I must decline to make any inquiry upon the subject.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will state why, at recent vacancies for three appointments for females at Armagh Post Office, two were allotted to Protestants, and a local Roman Catholic girl, who on first trial satisfied the requirements of the Civil Service Commissioners, was not accepted.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In January last, when the three vacancies at Armagh were filled, the senior learner had not qualified for an established appointment, and the vacancies were therefore filled by transfers from other offices. I know nothing of the religious belief of any of the officers concerned.

Dromod Pier.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the amount of the grant made by the Board of Works to the Shannon Development Company for the construction of a pier at Dromod; will he explain why this pier has been allowed to get into dilapidation; and whether inquiry will be made as to who is responsible for this state of matters

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham): The pier at Dromod was part of the old Shannon Navigation Works. No grant was made to the Shannon Development Company in respect of it. It is not now used for trading purposes, but is not in a state of dilapidation; and if there should be any indication of a revival of traffic, whatever repairs are necessary can be carried out at small cost.

Waterford and Wexford Dispensaries.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps have been taken to fill up the vacant dispensary appointments in the counties of Waterford and Wexford, for which no medical candidates offered themselves; and whether he can state how long this state of matters has continued and when it will be terminated.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): There are two vacancies; one, in County Waterford, occurred in August. In this case the guardians are considering a proposal to re-arrange the vacant and an adjoining district. The vacancy in County Wexford occurred at the end of June. An election to fill this vacancy is fixed to take place on Saturday next.

Athy Jurors' List.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a complaint from the Secretary of the Irish Poor Law Association as to the manner in which the Jurors' List for Athy, No. 1 District, has been prepared by the officials appointed under the recent change in the law; and whether he can state what action the Local Government Board have taken on this matter; and if he will promote legislation to have this work carried out under the former system.

Mr. WYNDHAM: A complaint of the character mentioned was received. The results of inquiries made by the Board go to show that the allegations are greatly exaggerated, and, in some cases, unfounded, and that on the whole the work is most carefully and efficiently done by the Secretary of the County Council. On the general question of the propriety of altering the existing law, I refer to my former replies.

Irish Land Bill.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps he has taken to promote a conference between landlords and tenants in view of the promised Land Purchase Bill; and if he is in a position to give the names of business experts who would be acceptable to both parties.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only refer the hon. Member to my public pronouncements on the Land Question. The reply to the second query is in the negative. It would, I think, be inexpedient and, indeed, officious, on my part to suggest names.

All-British Cable to India.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the recommendation of the Committee on Cable Communications, presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, in favour of a cable connecting the Cocos and Ceylon, or the Cocos and Singapore, and thus giving an alternative and an all-British line to India; and whether any steps are being taken towards the construction of such a cable.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The matter is engaging the attention of the Government at the present time. We are waiting a reply from the Government of India, with whom we have been in communication.

Tristan da Cunha Islands.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the possible value for telegraph purposes of the Tristan da Cunha group of islands, including Gough Island, steps are being taken to retain the ownership claim of the British Government over these islands.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: These islands are under British sovereignty. His Majesty's Government have now under consideration the question of granting further licences for the removal of guano from some of them. The group is periodically visited by one of His Majesty's vessels.

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—EXPENSES.

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of money to be provided by Parliament, of the Expenses of any application under Section 33 of the Fisheries (Ireland) Act, 1842, and all proceedings thereunder consequent thereon, which may become payable under any Act of the present session to amend the Fisheries (Ireland) Acts, 1842 to 1901 (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

[THIRD READING—FIRST DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

(2.35.) MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): In moving the recommittal of this Bill in respect of its financial Clauses I do not think I need offer any apology to the House for intervening in this debate. The financial policy of this Bill has never been adequately discussed. I need only point out that the amount of money already levied on various forms in the United Kingdom for the purpose of upholding our present system of education is simply colossal, and yet this Bill will considerably increase demands made upon the various contributors to the national funds, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer is to be bound to provide money for the education authority. The expenditure under the various headings of the Bill is of necessity automatic and progressive in its character, and it is not merely the present Chancellor of the Exchequer but his successors who will have to obey the behests of a third party. Though the expenditure on the Army and the Navy is rigidly scrutinised by the Treasury it is remarkable that there has been practically no discussion whatever with regard to the huge sum allocated for education. I venture to say, without going into the merits or demerits of our education policy, that grave doubts are widely entertained as to whether a great deal of this money is to be wisely and prudently expended. There are those who agree with me in thinking that with reference to the position of life and the future prospects of scholars the subjects which are selected are ill-assorted and are calculated to discourage them in after-life, instead of redounding to their personal or pecuniary advantage. I have often been asked "How can you expect these youths and girls to perform the ordinary calls of honest toil if they are to be allowed to think that they are above their position through receiving education in a half-smattering manner on subjects they will never have an opportunity of following to their logical conclusion?" I am one of those who think that the definitions applied the other day by the Prime Minister to the objects which should be included in primary education is the utmost limit to which Parliament has any right to proceed. That, of course, is a moot point. I do not wish to be dogmatic, or to raise a question which is outside the immediate scope of my Amendment. But I must remind the House that in this policy it is forestalling future Budgets and committing the country to a great increase in its expenditure, the utility of which many persons venture gravely to doubt.

What is the amount of money which the taxpayers alone, apart from the ratepayers, are now called upon to provide? I find that in the three kingdoms the amount provided in the current year for education is upwards of twelve and a half millions, and in many cases it is handed over to the tender mercies of enthusiasts who spend it right, left, and centre, without any regard to the interests of the taxpayers or the children. But that is not all. There is the Local Taxation (Customs and Excess) contribution, miscalled the "whisky money," half of which was specifically allocated by Parliament to the relief of the rates, but the whole of it is now left at the disposal of the County Councils. This sum amounts nearly to a million, bringing the total expenditure for which the Treasury is responsible to more than thirteen and a half millions. In addition, £1,400,000 is being provided by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to arrest the outcry of the ratepayers under this Bill. That surely is a huge addition to our national obligations which deserves consideration. That brings up the total to £15,000,000 sterling. But even that is not all. The burden on the ratepayer is extremely heavy at present, and I venture to think it will become still more so in the near future. It has been admitted that there is a further sum of £5,500,000 expended in the shape of rates at the present time and that brings the total expenditure to more than £20,000,000. I maintain that Parliament has failed to discharge its prime obligation of scrutinising and controlling such a huge item of national expenditure. I have heard paltry suggestions from time to time for dismissing a few hundreds or thousands of His Majesty's troops, and I have heard cheeseparing and somewhat mean, if not contemptible, proposals for disposing of the naval stores and cutting down the naval resources of the country, but I have not heard a word of protest against the acceptance of this huge national burden which Parliament is precluding itself by this Bill from in any way effectually controlling. It is almost unheard of that a great public expenditure like this should be treated in the haphazard way in which Parliament of late years has treated educational finance. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth is a staunch economist, and although he is prepared to spend national funds when occasion demands it, he nevertheless closely scrutinises all items of expenditure submitted to the House of Commons. But even he has not raised his powerful voice against this educational expenditure uncontrolled by Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman actually made a suggestion that if there were a few children in a remote part of the country special arrangements should be made to bring the mountain to Mahomet. I hope that those who have championed the cause of economy, not always too wisely, will have a few words to say on this absolutely uncontrolled expenditure which is being riveted on the neck of the nation for all time. I do not hesitate to say that a vast part of this money has been very unwisely expended. Nothing is more fatal to economy than to give one set of persons other persons' money to spend. I have always protested that, and many years ago I raised my voice here against the doctrine of subventions, which meant giving the taxpayers' money to the representatives of the ratepayers, who are tempted to say: "It is not our money, so we had better spend as much as we can locally." That has been the argument of many county financiers. The only true solution for these educational difficulties is that, inasmuch as the money is found from the pockets of the taxpayers, the representatives of the taxpayers ought to supersede the local authorities in the expenditure of the money. I recognise that this would involve the recasting of the whole Bill, which I would not venture to propose at this late stage. But the House has still in its hands the control of the financiers, which is its special prerogative, and one which we have no right to abrogate at the dictation of Ministers, however powerful, or public opinion so-called, however highly wrought or ill-informed. I hope we shall have from some authoritative exponent of the Government a statement clear and precise as to the estimated cost to the national taxpayer and the ratepayer of the educational system. I think we have a right to ask that, and I hold that it will not be to our credit if we do not address ourselves in earnest to the great and legitimate duty of the House of Commons, viz., the control of the national finance.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'be,' and add the words 're-committed in respect of Clauses 19 and 20 (Expenses and Borrowing).'"—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): My right hon. friend in his speech tried to induce the House to accept two propositions, which I am perfectly convinced will find favour neither on that side nor upon this. The first of these was that out of public funds no education should be supported which went beyond the three R's, and the second was that, inasmuch as the contribution from the Imperial Exchequer to education was so large, the control of that expenditure should rest entirely with the central authority, and that the local authority, neither in the shape of City or County Councils, nor in the shape of School Boards, should have anything to say in the matter.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Of course the local authority would spend its own rates. I was dealing with the money provided from Imperial funds.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will come to that in a moment. As regards the first point, I am not concerned to deny, nor is any serious advocate of education concerned to deny, that there may be, and there have been, cases in which people are, what is called, over-educated—that is to say, they have not received the kind of education which is of any use to them either in their private or public capacity, either as individuals or citizens. I would even go further, and say that I could conceive of a system of education so ill-managed that the multiplication of classes incapable of earning their living in what is called the learned occupations, and unfitted to earn their living in the unlearned occupations, might be a serious public inconvenience. That is perfectly true, and it is mere pedantry to deny it; but I do not believe that will be the result of this Bill, or that any such state of things is likely to follow from any educational efforts this House is likely to indulge in, and is far less likely to happen under a sound system of educational evolution, such as the Bill proposes, than under any centralised system. My hope and belief is that education will be managed on commonsense principles by the great local authorities, and by commonsense principles, I mean principles suited to the real genuine needs of their locality. What are my right hon. friend's financial proposals? He admits that education ought to be largely supported by the State; but what is the only possible conclusion from his arguments? Either that the State should contribute nothing or manage everything. Both dilemmas are equally impracticable and impossible. It would be quite impossible to ask the localities to bear the whole cost of education, primary, secondary, and technical; and I am sure it would be disastrous to take the other alternative and say that the State, inasmuch as it contributes so much, must manage everything. There is a third possibility—namely, that the State should manage the expenditure of all the money it contributes, and the locality all the money it contributes. That would be even more impossible than either of the other two, because it would mean that you are to have two sets of schools, one entirely managed by the State and the other by the locality. If my right hon. friend will consider all the possible alternatives, he will see that the alternative proposed in this Bill is the only one which will find general and practical acceptance. I would remind my right hon. friend that the expenditure by the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not the limitless sum which he seems to suppose. It does not rest with the local authority to determine how much is to be spent by the State. That is laid down with precision by the Bill. It is capable, no doubt, of automatic increase as the number of children increase, but no mere reckless expenditure on the part of the local authority will extract another shilling from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. No doubt his successors may be called upon to pay an increased grant, but that will depend solely on the number of children. I hope I have adequately answered the arguments of my right hon. friend, and that he will not think it necessary to press his Motion, but allow us at once to pass to the discussion of the more general issues raised by the Motion for the Third Reading of the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): My right hon. friend reproached me for certain proposals I made in reference to this Bill, and as to that I shall be perfectly prepared to justify my action at the proper time. Acting on the suggestion of the Leader of the House I will attempt to confine my remarks now to the question of the cost thrown upon this country by its educational policy. But I think this House has not done its duty in examining as it ought to be examined the expenditure involved in this Bill. We are the tribunal, and I venture to say the only tribunal, which has a right to interfere with the expenditure under the Bill; and, therefore, it was our duty to have informed Parliament in both its branches as to what was our view as to the extent of the expenditure involved. That we have not done. The Closure has prevented that examination which ought to have been given as to the effect of this Bill on expenditure, whether Imperial or local. We have got this complicated arrangement in respect to Imperial taxation, which, I confess, I am totally unable to understand myself.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the debate at present is confined to Sections 19 and 20, which raise the question not of the amount of expenditure but of its apportionment and the method of raising it by loan or otherwise. The observations of the right hon. Gentleman would of course be quite in order on the main Question, but are not in order on the Question before the House.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said he would not discuss the matter further; but would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that before the Bill left the House or immediately afterwards information should be given by the Government as to what was likely to be the amount of expenditure under it, both Imperial and local.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: How can we tell the amount of the local expenditure?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: There ought to be some material for obtaining information on the subject. For instance, it would be perfectly possible to give the amount of money received from endowments and fees; but as you, Mr. Speaker, have laid down that that is a question rather in connection with the general aspect of the Bill, I will reserve it.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that there was a question with reference to the apportionment of expenditure which it would be for the enlightenment of the House and the country if the President of the Board of Trade explained. In Clause 19 there were certain provisions for the treatment of School Board areas and non-School Board areas. These provisions had not been fully discussed, but it seemed to him that, taking the School Board districts generally, the rates would probably be reduced; whereas they would certainly be raised in the voluntary school district. A certain proportion, varying from a quarter to one half, would be spread over the county at large; but he should like to ask the Government how they justified that arrangement. If a parish found its own buildings, it would be unfair to charge it for the buildings in another parish. There was another question on which he did not appear clear, and that was with regard to current liabilities. He believed that there was something in the long and complicated schedules of the Bill which made the question clear to the initiated; but he thought it would be to the advantage of the uninitiated if the President of the Local Government Board could give an assurance that where a School Board had incurred liabilities other than in respect of buildings, such liabilities should be charged on the former School Board area, and not spread over the county at large. He hoped his right hon. friend would be able to give that assurance, and thereby allay the rather natural apprehension felt in some of the voluntary school districts. He would also wish to know whether, in future, the county authorities would get the amount payable under the Agricultural Rating Act to the School Boards in respect of School Board districts which in future would be under the county authority.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said his right hon. friend had correctly anticipated the effect of the Bill on the rates, as between board school and voluntary school districts. But he had overlooked the fact that the special relief which was given to the poor School Board districts at the time the grant-in-aid was voted for the voluntary schools would end under the Bill, because these poorer School Board districts would no longer be separately rated areas for the purposes of education. It was felt by the Government that something should be done to meet the case of these poorer districts in the future, and with that object in view they inserted the provision in the Bill that one-fourth of the local indebtedness of these poorer districts should be taken over by the local education authority and placed upon the county at large. The grants under the Agricultural Rating Act would in future be paid to the local education authority and not to the particular School Board districts, but those districts would benefit by the distribution of the whole cost of education over the county at large.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE asked what about the current liabilities.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not quite understand what his right hon. friend meant.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he referred to the debts other than capital charges.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had not received notice of the question, and, therefore, he could only reply in a guarded form. All the capital expenditure would be pooled, and all other expenditure, for which the local education authority would be responsible, would fall on the general rate, and not on the local rate.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER said that as the question he desired to raise could be discussed on the Third Reading, he wished to withdraw his Amendment

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

(3.10.) SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The House will recognise, with a considerable feeling of relief, that the long-protracted examination and discussion of this most important, and—as I am sure it will be regarded in the future—this most memorable measure is approaching the end. The general subject is, as we all know, of the most intense interest to the country. And well it might be, because upon the trained intelligence and equipment of our people the national future depends. It must be admitted that the subject in its details, the system in its machinery, are of the most complicated and technical character, and I think I shall find myself in the same lobby, mentally, with almost every Member of the House when I say that the discussion of those details was necessarily monotonous, dull, and uninspiring. What conclusion do I draw from this? It is that we should pay all honour to those among us who have devoted so much time and labour to the study and examination of this Bill, whether it be in defence of its provisions or in frustrating, exposing, and correcting its faults; and I am sure I speak for the House when I say that, while we have a sense of relief in anticipation of the end of these discussions, we are grateful to those of our colleagues who have devoted themselves in so earnest and systematic and praiseworthy a way to the examination and improvement of the Bill, and we are grateful to them for the spirit they have shown in devoting themselves to this work. No one, I think, can say that more time has been given to this measure than it required or deserved. As I have said, it is exceedingly complex and technical, and it had to pass through the ordeal of examination by men—and they abound among us—who are intimately acquainted with the details of the machinery of education, either from their own personal share in its administration or from their study of or the interest they have taken in the subject. But, besides that, this subject is intimately concerned with the daily domestic life of the people, and appeals in the strongest possible way to every father and mother who care for the welfare and the careers of their children. Again, every provision in a measure such as this is minutely examined, because it touches sincere and strong religious feelings and susceptibilities on either side of the House. I have observed with some astonishment that some hon. Members, mostly outside the walls of this House, have spoken lightly of these susceptibilities, and, if I may say so, prejudices, pronouncing them unreal and almost squalid, and thanking Heaven, apparently, that they themselves have no share in them. I cannot rise to that superior point of view, because, in my opinion, there are few aspects of the question which more thoroughly deserve the most careful treatment by Parliament. But for myself I would say frankly that from the first I have entertained strong objections to the whole scheme of the Bill; and I would say for myself, and those who think with me, that, while we have been honestly trying to amend the Bill, we have naturally and of course tried to amend it in the direction of our particular views.

Will the House allow me to state broadly the reasons of my objections to the Bill? My first broad ground of objection is this—that the Bill appears to endeavour to reconcile two things which are incompatible with each other, namely the national system of education and the denominational system. The one is the antithesis of the other. The only permanent system must be the national system. Of course denominational schools may be and would, almost under any system, continue to be recognised under certain conditions, and within certain limits. But as you develop your system the national must increase and the denominational decrease. Education is the affair of the State and not of the Church; the affair of laymen and not of the clergy. I know there are some of my friends who hold this view who say, "What does it matter, seeing that it is inevitable that you must glide sooner or later into a more purely national system—why raise such a particular dust about a particular form of control under this Bill? Make your schools efficient and you will call off the clerical element." I prefer to adopt a national system as the ideal, instead of ineffectually struggling against it, as you are doing in this Bill. My second ground of objection is based on this, that where there is public duty to be performed, and public money to be spent, the more direct and complete your public control the better. Now, I have found some words here—I am not quoting them as a *tu quoque*, but they are so characteristic and so true that I think it is worth while to quote them. They are the words of the present Duke of Devonshire spoken in the House of

Commons, probably from the place in which I now stand, in 1876—

> "There are many of us," he says, "and I do not scruple to say I am one of them, who believe that the principle of the School Boards is the right and true principle in this matter."

We believe that that, being the true and right principle, it will in the end prevail. We believe that when once the time has arrived, when Parliament has declared that education is the business of the State itself, it becomes inevitable that sooner or later State education must be in the hands not of individuals but of representatives of the people. That appears to me to be a very fair statement of the view I take.

What do we find under this Bill? That such public control as there is, is partial, remote, indirect, and diluted. The County Council, itself a body elected for quite other purposes and upon other issues, is to appoint the local committee. That local committee need have no elected member upon it. If that is the solution, you have at once a divorce between your controlling body and the public interest. But if there are County Councillors on this local committee, they are accompanied by members nominated by outside private and sectarian bodies. To a large extent, therefore, the responsibility to the public, originally weak, has already become diluted. Then the local committee appoints a sub-committee, and I would remind the House that this provision for the appointment of the sub-committee was passed *sub silentio* on one of those fatal nights when the closure fell upon the Schedules. How are these sub-committees to be constituted? They are to consist either all or partly of members of the committee. Here again outsiders are introduced on to the sub-committees, and that which has been already diluted is diluted again. But let us look at it a little more closely. Popular control was much insisted upon by the right hon. Gentleman when he introduced the Bill. He said there would be complete popular control over the whole educational system. When a statement like that is made, what does the plain man understand by it? He thinks the work of School Boards is only to be transferred to some other more convenient body; that is practically what it comes to. Again, it has been urged by many persons—I think the Colonial Secretary made a point of it during that celebrated colloquy at Birmingham—that there would be publicity. The right hon. Gentleman congratulated them on the publicity the new system would introduce into the management of Church schools. The local authority might be in a minority in the management, but they would be able to make themselves heard. Publicity, undoubtedly, is an all-important element of popular government; but where is the publicity in this Bill? Does the education committee, which is merely a critical body, make for publicity? The probability is that it will not. This is the body most corresponding to the School Board, and what small part of its proceedings will ever come before or be debated by the County Council, which is the only popular body to which the public can elect? How then will the minority on the committee of managers in denominational schools make themselves heard? When the point of contact is reached between the controlling authority and the school, how much of the representative element remains? Instead of *ad hoc* election we have *ad hoc* nomination and selection. What would a School Board be if it were without popular sympathy and support; without the knowledge that suspension of its functions would follow neglect of duty? These considerations constitute the second reason why I object to this scheme *in toto*.

My next objection has rather to do with education itself. It seems to me that this system fails to produce and supply the very thing that is wanted. The thing that is wanted is the ladder of learning for the boy of average brains and energy. The right hon. Gentleman, replying with some sympathy to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet just now, admitted that there were many cases in which the boy, or young man, or young woman, might be over-educated, and might be unfitted to take part in any of the learned professions, and yet be too learned for any other occupation. I believe that to be a great fallacy. If the training in our schools is of the right kind, the more learning a man has, whether he sweeps a crossing or controls a diocese, the better he will do his work. It is not only the most backward and retrograde, but also the most mischievous and dangerous doctrine, which says that learning in itself does any harm to the man who possesses it. "A little learning is a dangerous thing." But that is when a little learning is mistaken for a great deal of learning; and the man who possesses it does not know his position. I could speak of a country——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: You are not arguing against me, I hope?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am arguing at large. It seems to fit what the right hon. Gentleman said, if it does not express his real view. Of course, it is a view commonly and widely held on certain questions, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet will not deny that there is a country where you may see the shepherds and under-gamekeepers walking about with a Horace in their pocket. I myself have known a railway porter in that country who was the most accomplished astronomer in that part of the world, but who nevertheless was one of the best of railway porters. A ladder ought to be provided for every boy who is able to take advantage of it to enable him to reach the step he is capable of reaching. It seems to me that in this Bill you have been so much occupied with your schools and their fees and their funds, and your appointed trust managers of them and your nominated committee men, and with keeping a check on popular interference, that you have forgotten, to some extent unconsciously forgotten, education—the very thing for which the Bill exists. What was without doubt the best, the most efficient, the most successful part of the previously existing educational machinery? The continuation schools and the higher grade schools, and the higher schools conducted by the great School Boards. They were far more efficient than your Universities, which, with all their enormous funds and traditional advantages, educate only a fraction of the community, or than your public schools, of which we are so proud, where also learning is the last thing that is considered to be of much importance. It was these humble but earnest men in the board schools who were doing the very best work for you, and it is because they did it that you have destroyed them. You make it your excuse that you are overlapping, which you have been trained by your inspirers to think of as something terrible. Is our educational covering so full and ample that we can be so fastidious as to whether it is overlapping or not? What a crime for a public education authority to commit! *Trop de zèle.* It is actually destroyed because it has done too much. It was against the law, so we are told. Then the law ought to have been amended. That was the easy and plain way of getting over the difficulty.

Then, there is in this Bill and in the whole theory of your scheme a line drawn between primary and secondary education, and that is called unification and co-ordination. I think I have listened to a homily from the last Vice President of the Council in which he has declaimed against the vice of drawing a hard and fast line; and here is a fixed line. You have different authorities and different rating. You have the town schools and the village schools, which are, with their Church atmosphere, to be confined religiously and solemnly to primary education. Consider the result of that arrangement. A boy arrives at the critical period of his early life. He has finished his primary education. He has got all the advantage he can get out of your teaching in elementary subjects. What are we to do with such a boy? We ought to induce him, to tempt him, to use the opportunity of prosecuting the march up the ladder, and to do it in the most convenient and effectual way. Why should he not do it? What should prevent him doing it in the same school? At this critical age—critical because he has the opening of possible careers before him, or because his parents may see their way to his earning a little money for their assistance—you stop him and say, "Now you must go no longer to this school, but to a secondary school at the other end of the town, or to a secondary school five or ten miles away, in the county town." The boy therefore has to make a fresh start, to begin a new life, with fresh associates, away from all the old influences. In how many cases will he not subside into a contented ignorance from which it is our highest duty to save him? He is not to be allowed any longer to go to the primary school; what is then to take its place? He is to go to a secondary school. What are the circumstances of these schools? They are to be supported by limited funds—strictly limited funds—and those funds are to have permissive operation. Then your limited funds are to be largely mortgaged by the necessity of undertaking this very intermediate duty between primary and secondary education which the School Boards have so well discharged hitherto. Of the rate, of which we hear so much, how much will be absorbed by the various duties to be transferred? What was demanded, and rightly demanded, by the country, was a good continuous system of intermediate and higher education founded on a vigorous and complete primary system. What you have here is a permissive, limited, undefined secondary provision. You may spend twopence, if you can get it with the goodwill of your ratepayers. This is the outcome of fifty years of agitation for secondary education.

And in the primary schools, this Bill at least gives no guarantee whatever of efficiency. The primary schools—what are we to say of them? One thing is certain of them—they are to remain primary. No tentacles are to be put forward towards the higher learning. There is no educational fulcrum for the levelling up of education. Direct election, with its influence of enlightened public opinion, is gone. The power of declaring a School Board in default gives place to a *mandamus*. What is a *mandamus*? It is a terrible word. I am not lawyer enough to know what it precisely means, but I have no doubt it means that somebody is to be called upon to do something, and the result is that if he does not do what the Court calls upon him to do he goes to prison like other wicked people. Fancy a chairman of a County Council—there are two or three of them opposite—marched off to prison because some sub-committee has not done its duty! I suppose that is the meaning of this proceeding by *mandamus*.

Above all, and this is a most important point, the pressure of the rates will probably be such as may suggest to the new authority the most obviously economical expedient of levelling down the provided schools to the admittedly low level of the Church schools. ("Oh, oh!") I did not say that every Church school was bad, but it is notorious—that was the reason of the Bill—that they could not keep up to the mark, they could not keep pace with the board schools in the encouragement of education. If they are improved, that is what I call "levelling up," but a much more likely result will be levelling down. The threepenny rate will be dangled before the ratepayers' eyes. Lord Salisbury's suggestion of 1895 will probably be adopted, and "threepence" will be written in letters two feet long over every school. That is the greatest and the tremendous dead weight in this Bill against progress and efficiency in primary education, and, if anything was wanted to make its influence more complete, you have it in the actual instruction to committees to have regard to the economy of the rates—as if they were not likely to do that without being specially instructed.

Now, when the right hon. Gentleman introduced the Bill he made many representations and promises, the most prominent of which was the creation of one uniform authority. Especially there was much shaking of the head over the two rating authorities in the same area. I have taken the trouble to analyse geographically the different counties of England and Wales, and I come to a somewhat strange conclusion—that this ideal of the right hon. Gentleman is very limited in its operation. If I were to give a new title to the Bill and describe in one sentence the only effect of it which will be absolutely certain, I would call it a Bill for creating one education authority in the counties of Rutland and Huntingdon and in the Scilly Isles. There may be the same result attained in some of the smaller counties in Wales, but the result as far as England is concerned is literally what I have said. The population of England and Wales is 32½ millions. Deducting London's 4½ millions you have 28 millions. Of these, 9 millions are in the county boroughs, 6 millions in the municipal boroughs and urban districts over the limit prescribed in the Bill, 7½ millions in the rural districts, and 5½ millions in the smaller boroughs and smaller rural districts, making in the country parts 13 millions. Now let us consider the effect on these successively. First of all, county boroughs. There is one authority in the county boroughs, and one rating power is established. Therefore the county boroughs are the most happy from the Government point of view; but their happiness is qualified by the fact that there is no duty put upon them to supply higher education; they are only permitted to do so. There are two rates instead of one after all, the one for elementary and the other for secondary education. And then they are hampered, as I think, by what is called the Cockerton law. Then when we come to the smaller boroughs—six millions—the education is under two authorities; the primary is under the municipality, which has rating power, the secondary is under the County Council, which has rating power, and the urban authority may raise independently a penny rate for secondary education. So you have three systems and two rates. Therefore here the pretext for the abolition of the School Boards fails. Here you have multiplied control and possible overlapping, and no consecutive ladder such as we all profess to desire is provided, because the lower steps are under the control of one authority and the higher steps are controlled by another authority. Then you have the rural districts, the residue of the counties, the patchwork areas after others have been taken out, 13,000,000. Why, I believe that in the West Riding the time to go over these disconnected areas by inspectors will be measured by years. Nominally there is one supreme authority, but without the means for competent higher authority, for, as I have said the rate will be mopped up by the transfer of duties from the School Boards and the training colleges—which is a new burden to be put upon them. This sum of twopence may enable the authority to make grants in aid of existing schools, but who in the world believes it sufficient for equipping new schools? Again, there is no duty imposed to do anything at all.

Here then is your one authority! It consists of (1), the Board of Education; (2) the various Councils, with their different powers; (3) the committee or committees of these Councils, including outsiders—whom I almost ought to include in a separate category; (4) the sub-Commmittee with their outsiders; (5) the provided schools managers; and (6) the denominational schools managers, some of whom are to superintend, more or less, religious instruction—although as to that we are left in great doubt—and some of whom are to be appointed members.

But we have not yet explored exhaustively this starry firmament. We discover by its disturbing influence rather than by actual vision, another mighty element. So did the acute, learned, and watchful astronomer recognise the existence of the planet Neptune by its influence on other heavenly bodies before it came within range of his telescope; he calculated its size, although he had never seen it, and the only thing he did not discover, to the surprise of the American humorist, was the name of the planet; that followed the actual vision. We, however, know our planet, his size, his name, and everything about him; he is the Bishop. I should be disposed, if I might without disrespect, and I believe I should express the sentiment of many others in doing so, to meet the discovery with the expression, *Que diable allait-il fair dans cette galère?"* He is established under the mantle of the hon. and gallant Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire; he shoves his nominees on the committees and sub-committees, he directs and guides the teaching in denominational schools, he keeps up the *calorifere*, he pumps in the proper atmosphere, he sees that the inner door has its hinges well oiled. An ingenious friend of mine has furnished me with a little diagram showing the effect of all these different authorities. It looks like a family tree, or perhaps it more resembles in some respects those wax models of the human frame, with the skin removed, the veins shown in one colour, the arteries in another, the nerves in a third, and so on. Here are the ecclesiastical ramifications coloured red, and the civil control in black, and they run through each other from the beginning to the end of the whole business; and this ecclesiastical tree sends out its branches into the entire system.

Here is your unification and coordination; here is your public control and all the other advantages you have promised; here is your provision for infusing fresh vitality into this old nation to enable it to set up successful rivalry with its competitors. Why, Sir, I could go on at length pointing out inconsistencies and injustices, but I have said enough for my purpose. The crowning defect of this Bill is that it fails to create—nay, it does its best to smother and alienate—that popular interest in education, that appreciation of it, and that desire for it, without which the best system the ingenuity of man could devise would fail. On that ground, if on no other, I hold it to be unworthy of the support of the House, and therefore beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. WALTER LONG: Anybody who today had strayed into the House for the first time to listen to our debates, would have found it hard to believe that we were commencing the last stage of the discussions on a Bill which we have been assured is one of the worst measures ever brought into the House of Commons, and one which has shaken the heart of the nation to its foundation. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition must, I think, have forced many of us, on this side at all events, to the conclusion that he had failed to do two things which he should have done before proposing the rejection of the Bill—first, seriously to address himself to the consideration of the practical problem with which the Government were faced and had to deal when they approached this question, and secondly, carefully to study the Bill itself. Throughout the greater part of his speech the right hon. Gentleman failed altogether to realise the practical difficulties with which the Government were confronted when they came to the consideration of the education problem. The right hon. Gentleman said a great deal in criticism of our proposals, but it would be difficult to discover from his criticism what policy he would recommend the country to adopt if he were sitting on this instead of on that side of the House.

So far as I was able to follow his criticism, his suggestion is that instead of the proposals of the Government a universal system of School Boards ought to be established. I do not know whether I am right or wrong. If I am right, I say that the right hon. Gentleman has failed to appreciate one of the elementary facts of this education problem with which every student has been face to face for many years. The right hon. Gentleman talks of the position of the School Boards solely from the point of view of the School Boards in the towns, and he ignores the difficulties in all the rest of the schools of the country. He talks only of the School Boards in the large towns, where, it is true, they have done some excellent work for elementary education, and where they have made excellent efforts in connection with secondary education. When he says that these School Boards have done this good work, and we are displacing them because they have done it, he talks as if School Boards generally had done this and made this provision; but he fails altogether to recognise that outside the large School Board areas it has in the past been impossible to make any efforts at all in the direction of secondary education.

The right hon. Gentleman found some fault with our Bill for reasons which I will refer to very briefly. His first criticism was that we were trying to do the impossible, and that we were trying to reconcile a national system with a denominational system. He also said that the denominational system must come to an end and the national system must prevail. In regard to the great Act of 1870 which passed through Parliament, precisely the reverse has followed to that which has been prophesied by the right hon. Gentleman. What is the position of the voluntary schools today? Have we been driven into a national system by the Act of 1870? The right hon. Gentleman, like other critics of the Government, seems to me to have fallen into the error, both in this House and in the country, of determining to ignore altogether all that has been done by the denominational system, and while he is full of praise for the School Boards, he had not one word to say for the great work of education done by the various churches, a great deal of which was done at a time when no national system of education was provided.

I will say a word presently about the right hon. Gentleman's comments upon public control. As to his general criticism on the Bill, I maintain that whether his criticism is upon the way in which we deal with School Boards, or upon the attempts at unification, it is a humorous description of the new education authority brought into existence under this Bill, and his criticisms are made because he fails to realise what are the essential difficulties with which we have to deal in this country. The right hon. Gentleman found fault because we have the County Council as the education authority and also the Council of the smaller boroughs. If the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had been sitting on the Treasury Bench and responsible for the Government, does believe, either in regard to education or any other form of local government, he would be able to propose to this House a measure which ignored the position of the existing boroughs and the larger urban districts in regard to their powers of administration and rating? If he does believe that, then it is not fair to say that we are doing nothing. He says that all we do is to abolish the School Boards; but is that nothing? You must select one authority, and we have gone as far as we can in the direction of unification—as far as it is practical. When the right hon. Gentleman says we have abolished School Boards, no doubt he is right, but does he propose to transfer the powers of the Municipal Councils to the School Boards, or leave the two bodies to work in the same area?

We must come, after all these vague criticisms, to the consideration of the practical question. Have we approached this problem with a due regard to the practical difficulties which exist, or have we done—as I submit we have—the best that was possible under the circumstances? I do not deny that the right hon. Gentleman might be able to propose a general remedy if you had no municipal districts and no powers and statutes already in existence, but that is not the case here. This is the main difficulty we have always to contend with when we deal with local government. You are compelled to have regard to the existing authorities and their powers, and it is impossible to override their powers wholesale or to ignore the position which these local authorities have occupied. We have done this, and I venture to repeat that the right hon. Gentleman is not justified in criticising us unless he is prepared to tell us that, if he had been in our place, he would have been more courageous.

What, after all, are the main criticisms? The right hon. Gentleman has repeated them. I do not wonder that he has not repeated all the criticisms that have been made, because of the length of time and the number of speeches which they have occupied. The length to which many of these speeches ran naturally led to this result, that there is very little left to be said on either side in regard to this question; and the right hon. Gentleman has practically repeated criticisms which we have already met many times, and they come to this: That the proposal of the Government is unjust, because it does too much for the denominational system, because it is a departure from the recognised principles of local government, and that it is so unjust and so bad that it will not be workable, and the local authorities will decline to carry it out. Is there any foundation for these very serious charges? The right hon. Gentleman, as I have already said, does not seem to me to have attempted to grapple with the real difficulties of this question. He says we were forced to deal with it because of the Cockerton judgment. I submit that that is only a very partial statement of the case.

The right hon. Gentleman himself, in the speeches he made in the country at the time of the General Election, declared that education and the completion of the educational system was one of the first questions to which any Government ought to address itself. In all parts of the country speeches were made declaring that national education should be dealt with by the Government, and therefore to suggest that we dealt with it in order to get rid of the School Boards is to make a statement which cannot possibly be maintained. We were face to face with the educational difficulty as it existed. You had a large number of local authorities. You had 2,500 School Boards with 5,800 board schools under their control, and 14,000 voluntary schools which gave you over 15,000 independent education authorities with no co-ordination and no connection whatever between them, and no means whatever by which the County Council, charged as it is with secondary education, could connect secondary education with elementary education. There was no inducement given to the minor local authorities to unite their system with the system of the superior authority.

That was the practical problem which we had to face. We faced it, as the House knows, by, so far as we could, limiting the number of authorities responsible for education. We have given the County Council wide powers. We have given the boroughs with a population of 10,000, and urban districts with 20,000 inhabitants, control over their own elementary education. In place of these 15,000 local authorities charged with the duties of education and with the task of providing funds for education. this Bill will provide a very greatly reduced number of authorities, and will enable the main local authority to control the education of the country in a way that was impossible before.

The right hon. Gentleman says that we have done all this to preserve the denominational system. Whether you have regard to the historical aspect of the question or the work that this denominational system has done, or from the practical point of view of pounds, shillings, and pence, no other course was possible than the one the Government has adopted. I will not take up the time of the House by going into the historical question. Everybody knows what has been done to provide educational facilities. Let the House look at the question from a pounds, shillings, and pence point of view. The House is familiar with the various estimates which have been made, but a very moderate estimate puts the providing of additional school places, if all the voluntary schools were got rid of, at twenty-five millions sterling. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!" and an HON. MEMBER: "About £15,000,000!"] In order to save time, I will take it at £15,000,000 for the purposes of argument. That is a very serious sum. We are told that we ought to have bought out all these voluntary schools. If it had been just and right to do this in the interests of education, would it have been a sensible policy to suggest? These schools are already in existence, and many of them, I say, are very excellent schools, notwithstanding what the right hon. Gentleman has said, for the work done in them. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, unfairly and unduly stated the case against the voluntary schools when he appeared to imply that a very large number of them are unsuitable for educational purposes. It is quite true that here and there there are voluntary schools of an unsatisfactory kind—[An HON. MEMBER: "There are also bad board schools!"—but there are a great many very excellent voluntary schools.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): Hear, hear!

MR. WALTER LONG: The right hon. Gentleman says the origin of this Bill was the cry of the supporters of voluntary schools that they could not provide for their schools, but that was not their cry. What was said, and said with great truth and force, was that it was not just that they should have to provide for voluntary schools on the one hand, and on the other hand be rated for the maintenance of board schools. They also said that the competition between the schools provided out of the rates by an elected body who thought of nothing but what they had to do as the education authority, and a school which had no rates to fall back upon, was very severe and unfair. But nevertheless they struggled on with great self-denial and difficulty, and found large sums of money in order to maintain and improve these voluntary schools. It would have been a gross injustice to them to have ignored all the work they had done, and from a business point of view it would have been an act of folly to have turned over these 15,000 schools from those who now owned them to a new body; and for what reason? For no reason on earth except that hon. Gentlemen opposite believe and try to prove that the control over these schools is not sufficient. The control which the local authority will have is full and complete, and I can show to the House that these educational proposals of the Government follow strictly and completely all precedents in regard to the past history of local government. What has been the form which local government has taken in regard to the poor law and in regard to highways? They were maintained by the parishes and by highway districts, and Parliament made what had been a charge upon a district a charge upon the whole parish or county. The same cry was raised then as now. It is obvious that whatever portion of this expenditure is to be borne out of the local rates, if you are going to transfer the burden and spread it over a wider area or over the county, there must be an imposition of a fresh burden upon some of the ratepayers, although there is a real relief given to the other ratepayers. The system may not be the best that could be adopted, but the Prime Minister in the Bill which he has now very nearly carried through this House has followed strictly and accurately the precedents in regard to local government.

I maintain that there is only one other course if the House rejects these proposals, and that is to adopt what apparently finds favour with the right hon. Gentleman opposite, namely, what is known as the *ad hoc* system. Does anybody seriously suppose now, in 1902, that in any proposals for education or any similar purpose we are to revert again to an *ad hoc* election of a separate body for this particular work? [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.] Then all I can say is that Gentlemen who make that proposal fly absolutely in the face of the experience of the last twenty years with respect to local government. If there is one truth that is more persistently borne in upon anybody who has studied local government than another, it has been that by the multiplication of local authorities, the multiplication of elections, and the confusion of responsibilities and duties, you have sickened the people regarding these popular and local bodies, and if you are going to revive interest, if you are going to whip the people up to take an interest in elections, and if you are going to bring in the right sort of people to serve on local bodies, it will only be by reducing the number of local elected bodies, and by concentrating the work in the hands of one or more of them, and so far as possible, making it perfectly clear that the local authority for a particular area, and not a local authority for this, that, or the other, is the local authority responsible to that locality for all that most affects the comfort, the happiness, and the whole well-being of the people Therefore to suggest that our system is wrong because we have not adopted the *ad hoc* system in our proposals, is to fly in the very teeth of the experience of anybody who has taken the trouble to study the question.

What is the nature of the charge that is made against the local authority? It is—and the right hon. Gentleman repeated this—that the control of the local authority is not a real one. We are asked to believe that the local authority has no control. The right hon. Gentleman told us that the control of the local authority is remote and indirect, and he had a great deal to say about committees and sub-committees. I have made it my business to examine and to put down very briefly here what is exactly the position of the local authority, which the right hon. Gentleman said is so remote and indirect that its authority is practically *nil*. In the first place, the local authority publicly elected is responsible for and has full control over all secular education in its area. In the second place, it appoints one-third of the managers in the non-provided schools. It has the right to inspect all the schools within its area. In the next place, the managers are compelled under this Bill when it becomes law to carry out all the instructions with regard to secular education which the local authority sees fit to give them. They also exercise powers as to the qualifications of the teachers employed in the schools. The managers have the power of dismissal of teachers on educational grounds. The consent of the local authority is required to the appointment and dismissal of teachers upon educational grounds, the managers are compelled to provide the schools and maintain them; and the local authority has power to provide a new school with the consent of the Education Department. I submit that that is a list of powers—powers given for the first time—to these popularly elected education authorities, which if it is accurate, and I maintain it is accurate, entirely disposes of the argument on which the right hon. Gentleman based his contention that the position of the local authority is a sham, and that it has no reality. Their control is full and complete.

The local authority, the right hon. Gentleman tells us, acts through committees, and its power is therefore diluted. To listen to these attacks upon the Bill one would think that the Gentlemen who make them had never studied or taken any interest in the local government of our country. What after all is our system of local government? It is a system of local government where the local authority is supreme, but where the whole work is done through committees of various kinds. We have been told all through these debates that there is no precedent for the devolution of work from the County Councils to the committees. Has the right hon. Gentleman never heard of the Standing Joint Committee? Does he pretend that that is an unpopular body, or that it does its work badly, or that it has not been loyally accepted by the people of our various counties? There are several other committees of the local authorities which stand in the same position. But the local education committee is not independent of the County Council. It is not in the position of the Standing Joint Committee. It has not got the right to issue its precept for expenditure; it has to come back to the County Council for every penny that it spends, and it has to receive the assent and the approval of the County Council for the expenditure. It has no right to expend money without the knowledge and approval of the County Council. If that be the case, and it is the case, how can it be maintained that the position of the local authority with regard to education is a sham, and that it has not got full and complete control? The right hon. Gentleman tells us that the County Councils that are suddenly to be made the education authorities are not elected for this purpose at all. I have listened to that statement, made repeatedly in the course of these debates, and for the life of me I cannot see what force it has. If there is anything in it at all it would follow that you are never to pass measures through the House conferring fresh powers on the local authorities of the country until you have first consulted them as to what view they would take of the proposal. What is the history of local Government? Is it not the case that local authorities have been created and their duties have been added to from time to time, and is there any reason why we should not entrust them with this educational work? The right hon. Gentleman said that they had not had educational work to perform hitherto. A great many of them have done excellent work with funds provided, not out of the rates, but in connection with what was called the "whisky money," which was given for that purpose. I maintain that there is no justification whatever for the argument of the Leader of the Opposition and his friends that the County Councils are not bodies created for this purpose, and that therefore they ought not to be entrusted with the work which they will have to do. I submit that I have shown that this Bill follows, and follows closely, the precedents to be found in previous history in regard to local government, and that the control of the local authority is full and complete in every way.

We have heard something said, not by the right hon. Gentleman, but by other critics, many on our own side of the House, in regard to the question of finance. My right hon. friend the Member for Thanet spoke strongly upon that in the earlier part of our proceedings this afternoon. I have already said that the new local authority has full control with regard to expenditure. They alone can authorise expenditure, they alone can levy the rates necessary. But my right hon. friend asked that the Government should state more clearly what was their estimate of the expenditure which will be incurred under this Bill. It is quite impossible for anybody to say what will be the amount of that portion of the expenditure which is dependent upon the decision of the local authorities, and which they will provide for themselves. The local authority is given a very wide discretion. It is given the power to decide what shall be the standard, and what shall be done with regard to education in its own area. It is impossible for us to lay down what will be the view taken by each local authority of the work necessary in its own area. We know what are the grants in aid that are being made under these new proposals, and I venture to say, with great respect to hon. Members on both sides of the House, that the contribution made out of the Exchequer is more liberal than, as a rule, has been made in Bills of this kind. What is it, after all, that the Government provide? The new grant under the Bill is estimated to run to £2,100,000. The grants as they stand now are £625,000 for voluntary schools, £217,000 for School Boards, a total of £842,000. Deducting that from the £2,100,000, we have an additional grant of £1,257,500. The present voluntary subscriptions in 1901 amounted to £834,000. It is said that these will disappear, but I hope not. But assuming that the sum remains, and is passed over to repairs, there still remains £466,000 additional grant in aid of rates. I should be the last person in the world to suggest that this should be regarded as a final settlement, but I do say that at this stage it is as much as could be asked from the Government. The whole question of taxation, the distribution of the burden between the Imperial and the local exchequers, is one which must be approached by Parliament, and I hope satisfactorily settled, before long. But I submit that in connection with this expenditure on education itwould be unreasonable to ask that more should be done at the present moment.

I want to deal with one question which must remain for the present a matter of opinion. We have been told repeatedly during these debates that the County Councils and others are not going to give effect to this Bill if it passes. I may be more sanguine than hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I confess that I do not share that opinion. Hon. Gentlemen opposite may criticise this Bill adversely, but I do not think any of them will deny that there is in it a great deal that must be useful, that there is an abundant opportunity for good educational work, for a steady advance of education, if it is taken full advantage of. The Leader of the Opposition, if there was to be a change of Government, would, no doubt, speak with greater authority from this side of the House than from that, but we have not heard one word from him which would justify us in believing that some more generous or satisfactory proposal would come from them. What is it that these local authorities will have to face? First, that this Bill undoubtedly gives them opportunities which will enable them to do great good in educational work; that the present education system is incomplete; that there are gaps to be filled up, and a great deal of work to be done. Are they going to decline to complete this chain so far as this Bill will enable them to do it? Are they going to say, "No, we admit there is work to be done, but we will not do it because this Bill does not meet our wishes?" The main criticism of the Bill is not that it falls short of what it should be in its practical proposals. It is that it does too much for denominational schools. The children of the country are asking for bread in the form of education; are you going to give them, in answer, the stone of religious controversy? Are you going to say to them, "We admit that there is good in this Bill, that it gives us great opportunities for educational reform and advancement, but because we say that we object to your system, that of maintaining in existence the denominational schools, therefore for that reason alone we will turn our backs on all the opportunities with which you have presented us, and we will do nothing for the people of our district, whatever they may be doing in others?" I do not believe that to be a true forecast of what the local authorities will do. I believe that they will realise their responsibility, and appreciate their opportunities. I believe they will do under this Bill what they have done under previous Acts of Parliament—they will realise what is possible, they will approach their work with a single-minded desire to do their best for those among whom they live. I believe they will find in this Bill the machinery necessary for the purpose, and I believe that they will give effect to it, and thereby do great and lasting good to the nation.

*(4.30.) SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The greater portion of the religious controversy on which we have been engaged in considering this Bill has proceeded not from this side but from the other side of the House; and, while we on this side have said singularly little on any form of religious controversy, we have been auditors of very long debates on religious subjects, which have proceeded from the other side. The right hon. Gentleman said that my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition

failed to realise the difficulties of the Government, and that that was why my right hon. friend was unable to properly criticise the scheme of the Bill. It is our view that these difficulties are mainly of their own creation, and that it is the plan on which they have chosen to deal with the subject that is responsible for the difficulties in which they find themselves, and the difficulties into which they have plunged the country. The right hon. Gentleman said that in abolishing the School Boards of the country it was impossible for the Government to ignore the Town Councils; but he spoke of them as though they were hostile representatives of local feeling to the School Boards.

MR. WALTER LONG dissented.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government could not ignore the Town Councils.

MR. WALTER LONG: But I did not say that they were hostile representatives of local feeling.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The right hon. Gentleman said that in abolishing the School Boards they could not ignore the Town Councils, and that seemed to the right hon. Gentleman to be a ground for handing over these duties to the Councils, very largely against their own wishes. The right hon. Gentleman ignored the fact that there are hon. Members present who represent constituencies in which the Town Councils and the School Boards take precisely the same view of this Bill, and where the School Board, which it is proposed to abolish, and the Town Council, to whom it is proposed to hand over these duties, equally condemn the Bill. Indeed, in many cases, the Bill is more strongly condemned by the Town Council than by the School Board. The right hon. Gentleman made his main appeal to the House by saying that no other course was possible. No other course possible than one which two years ago no one in the country foresaw, than one which three years ago the Government themselves did not foresee, than one which the Archbishop of Canterbury said was impossible until Convocation passed Resolutions in favour of it! The right hon. Gentleman told the House that the control to be given by the Bill to a popularly elective authority would be full and complete in every way; and as an example of the extreme popularity of these elective bodies to whom the work was to be given, he instanced the Standing Joint Committee of the rural County Councils. A body less popular, less really representative of the ratepayers is hardly known; and the right hon. Gentleman must have a curious notion of what is a popularly elective body for functions of this kind if he thinks——

MR. WALTER LONG: The right hon. Gentleman has misunderstood me. I did not say it was a popularly elective body.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The word popular occurred just before and just after the right hon. Gentleman's reference; but, at all events, he compared the Standing Committee with popularly elected School Boards in direct touch with the ratepayers. Now I take issue with the whole principle of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. In the division on leave to bring in the Bill only about twenty-five of us voted No! Most of those who have lately taken the strongest course against the Bill were opposed to our action at the time. We divided because we thought the Bill hopelessly bad. They did not, but have now for the most part come over to our view. The one Liberal Member representing a Scottish constituency not directly affected, who still holds out, and two or three advanced men outside the House, for whose opinions also those who care for education have a high respect, have continued to be favourable to the Bill because they think it creates in each district a single educational authority. We need not inquire if that is so. It is enough that, as regards the rural counties, the single authority is a bad one, because the area is far too large. In the rural areas themselves this opinion is generally entertained. Tories and Liberal Unionists hold it as strongly as we do; and on this main point all reasonable people are agreed. The opposition is reinforced in the rural areas of the West of England by the strong feeling which exists among Churchmen as to the jobbery by which the public money, specially granted a few years ago to voluntary schools, has been wasted by Diocesan Boards. The special representation of the Diocesan Boards on the County Education Committee is a portion of the Government plan.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): Does the right hon. Gentleman refer to Diocesan Boards? What does he mean by jobbery? It is not a word that should be lightly used.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I do not mean that the members of those Boards stole the money; but I mean that money has been given to the schools which had the strongest representation on the Boards, and was not given to the poor schools for which the House intended it.

*MR. TALBOT: I think that is a statement which should be substantiated by facts.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: It is substantiated by many votes at elections in the West of England. The facts as regards Gloucestershire have been published; and the authorities of Church schools have themselves published the definite figures for the West of England in the local press. Those of us who opposed the Bill of 1870 as unduly favourable to voluntary schools, —my right hon. friend the Member for Monmouthshire, my noble friend the Member for Wiltshire, with myself—had come to hope that a School Board system based on popular election in convenient areas, would, in the long run, give us a national system. School Boards were not originally in the Bill of 1870. They were put in by the House, unanimously as regards London, although the London School Board is now also to be destroyed in 1903. As regards the rest of the country, my suggestion of 1870, to have School Boards elected by the ratepayers, carried half the House of Commons against the Government of the day, with the effect that the Government yielded to our view. We believed that the School Boards would gradually supersede the temporary system, as we thought it, of State-aided voluntary schools. It was not so. Still we have accepted, in practice, the compromise of 1870, as modified by subsequent legislation. It was, on the whole, working well. It was working in the rural counties far better than this Bill will work for elementary education. The large School Board districts are excellent; educationally much better than will be the rural county. In the rest of the rural districts the system is not bad for its cost, although it is run very cheaply in many cases. This Bill destroys School Boards, which are doing the best work, and, outside the School Board areas, offers no certainty of improvement, but only an assured additional charge. In the towns it will uproot what exists, substitute chaos for a time, and, in the long run, a system no better than the present, which is good.

The right hon. Gentleman claimed credit for the higher education portion of the Bill, and referred to the necessity of dealing with the difficulties which had arisen. But these difficulties were brought on the Government by the Cockerton judgment, the result of which they controlled. We have never opposed the part of the Bill dealing with higher education, and our Amendments were not wrecking Amendments, but were designed to strengthen the Bill. As regards higher education, the School Boards had, rightly we think, done much, and might have done more had they not been interfered with. But we have offered no opposition to the proposals for higher education. We admit that the country was ready for a measure of higher education which might have been carried easily, and might have been a stronger and better measure than the higher education portion of this Bill. The School Board system has been abolished by the House of Commons against, I am convinced, the opinion of the majority of the people, in the districts in which and for which School Boards exist. We regret the destruction of a directly-elective education system, the loss from the School Boards of the workmen, and of others who, as representatives of the localities really within the knowledge of the electorate, have learned the work and done the work admirably in the past. If there were to be a new departure, if the risk of creating an entirely new authority was to be run, then, surely, it should have been in connection with the creation of a really national system, by the purchase or renting of the voluntary schools and their government by the people in districts of moderate size, not in unmanageable areas, such as Lancashire or the West Riding. Even in counties of middling size, the county town is often difficult of access.

As regards the details of the Government plan, they have been carried by the Closure without adequate discussion. The financial proposals which were discussed were so new at the moment of the debate that it was impossible to bring home to the House the injustice which is done by the extraordinary variation of the rate between parish and parish in one county, under one uthority—variation of the rate, without any variation of what is obtained in exchange for it. The strongest case of all is perhaps that of areas which formed a group of united parishes in a School Board district. Some of them not benefited in any way, must find three-quarters, or less, probably a half, of the capital expenditure, including that on the schoolmaster's house, in a distant parish, and get no consideration for it from the county, while a voluntary school obtains a rent from the county in such cases. Yet the property in the case of the dissolved School Board district is at the absolute command of the County Council, though the district pays and receives nothing. In the other case, where the County Council pays a rent, the schoolmaster's house is not at the command of the county except during elementary school secular hours. As regards the financial considerations, a curious matter arises, that will have to be considered when the time comes, but it is the fact that there are two Amendments which are required to make the Government scheme complete. Those Amendments have not been carried, and if the Government scheme is to work, it was the duty of the Government to have re-committed this Bill today in order to incorporate those Amendments. The Closure which brought about this result has caused very considerable ambiguity in other matters besides the financial propositions of the Bill. It will be responsible for complexities in its provisions which will make it very difficult indeed for willing authorities to carry out the Bill. Owing to the mode in which we have been forced to legislate, the obscurity of the Bill is not confined to the Kenyon-Slaney incomprehensible Amendment, which ought to be made a 40th Article of the Church of England, for it has a similar Parliamentary sanction. Among the new principles rammed in on Thursday night by Closure, without the opportunity of discussion, is an episcopal veto on orders as to the management of voluntary schools, in the form of an opportunity of dissent on the part of either House of Parliament.

But it is with principle that on this occasion we can best deal. It is our view that to throw the so-called voluntary schools almost entirely on to rates and taxes cuts us off from the movement of the world in education, and constitutes the first thoroughly reactionary piece of legislation in English-speaking countries in our time. The result of what has been done must be that those who desired to keep rural local government away from Party, and to elect to the County Councils all those who, while out of political sympathy with the districts which they represent, are gratefully admired for the work which in the past, they have well done, will have to join in fighting all the County Council seats upon this Bill. The schemes are to be passed by the existing County Councils, elected without the slightest suspicion that they would have to deal with primary education. The spirit in which the existing authorities are likely to treat the question may be seen from the action which many of them have already taken. Some indeed, however, have declared against the Bill; Wiltshire, for example, by two to one, although there is a Unionist majority upon the Council. A dozen Unionists walked out of the room in order not to have to vote, and others of them voted against the Bill. In Gloucester the same thing happened; and a minority of only eight, deserted by their Unionist friends who walked out, ventured to pronounce themselves favourable to the Bill. In some areas the Councils have not been allowed to express a free opinion. In Gloucestershire the right hon. Baronet the Chairman of the County Council treated his Council as the Archb shop o York is said to have treated the House of Laymen. The Member for the Tewkesbury Division ruled a Motion out of order on the ground that it was not the custom of the Council to discuss Bills before Parliament. When it was shown that there was a precedent of his own making, he held that the gentleman who wished to move a resolution against the Bill could only read his notice and ask the Council to place it on the agenda for next Christmas. This notice the Chairman at once called on the Council to reject without debate, saying that the Council could not allow discussion in advance. Before the train containing the representatives of the western portion of the county reached the county capital he threw out the motion by a majority.

After the old County Councils have prepared the scheme for the constitution of the Committee and the working of the Bill, behind the back of their electors, the new County Councils, to be elected in the spring of 1904, will be elected on this question and will have to reverse the scheme, or even block the scheme until they get their way — the way of the majority. The electors have been challenged by the statement that the County Council is a democratically-elected authority, and we must accept the challenge. It is the only way of making the new system national, but it means carrying the struggle in which we have been here engaged into every parish in the country. We shall do so under some disadvantage. We have allowed the rural magnates to be elected without opposition. Moreover, the franchise and the distribution of seats are far from democratic. The electoral districts are not based on population, but on rateable value, area, and population; and area means the exact opposite of population. To the Gloucestershire County Council nearly 12,000 people in an urban district return one Member, an opponent of this Bill: and three Conservative seats, held by supporters of the Bill, have between 2,000 and 3,000 electors each, or, all three together, far fewer than are represented by one opponent and the same number as are represented by another opponent of the Bill. The existence of county aldermen still further removes the majority from the democratic control of the electorate. That electorate itself is far from being popular or democratic, for, while in hardly any case are two miners or two labourers to be found on the county register for a single house, I have named a case where eight supporters of the Bill, six brothers and two sisters, have recently been placed upon the county register in respect of a single country house. The First Lord spoke on Friday of the School Board system as "the only popular system which at present exists." He preaches excellent funeral sermons. But he was the murderer. There is no *resurgam* on the School Board tombstone; but we shall fight to make the county a great School Board, animated by our spirit and converted to our views. It is not on Nonconformist but on national lines that we shall fight, aided no doubt by that warfare between two clerical factions whose internecine hatreds are far stronger than is the hostility of Protestant dissenters to the Church.

Some have advised the refusal of the rate. There are those whose conscience is so touched that they will refuse to pay and will endure whatever consequences are imposed. If the policy should be recommended to others whose consciences are not affected, it becomes an alternative policy; an alternative to the necessary policy of fighting every County Council seat. None of us would attempt to argue with those to whom it is a case of conscience. Most of us here feel that it is as objectionable to have to pay taxes permanently towards a non-national system as to pay rates. When it comes to advising those whose consciences are not touched, I do not think we can advise them to refuse the rate. We shall advise them to fight every County Council seat, and then, after the unnecessary conflict forced upon us is conlcuded, we may hope that the rural county will become one great, though cumbersome, School Board, capable of discharging, less well, the function which School Boards for districts of moderate size performed so admirably under the system which you have destroyed. There is no third policy. Some call on us to declare that we shall repeal the act when we come into power. It will never be repealed, though it must be amended. Humpty-Dumpty cannot be set up again. The School Boards once destroyed are destroyed for ever. But the rural county can be cut up into districts under the Bill and each of these made into a great popular School Board.

There are some of us who deeply regret that the time of the Prime Minister in his first session as Prime Minister should have been spent upon this unhappy Bill. His high and deserved personal reputation has gained by his tactical conduct of the Bill. But some of us had hoped to be able to work with him, though from opposite sides of the House, towards national ends. Now he has turned every parish into a cockpit. It is with sorrow that we find ourselves called upon to consume for a year and a quarter all our energies in a fight of half the nation against the other half; but in that struggle we do not expect to prove inferior to our traditions.

(5.6) Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford): I should not have taken part in this debate at its present stage but for an expression used by the right hon. Baronet opposite, which I think ought to be challenged at the earliest possible moment. The right hon. Baronet brought a charge of jobbery against the Diocesan Boards. I challenge him, either inside or outside the House, now or hereafter, to bring forward a single fact which can really justify such an allegation.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I will supply the hon. and learned Member with the facts as soon as I can get them; they were published about a year and a half ago.

Mr. CRIPPS: I have seen the accounts, but the fact that accounts are published is no justification of a charge of this kind. It is natural enough that where you have limited funds at your disposal, the people who do not get so large a portion of those funds as they had hoped for should be discontented. We all admit that, but I say that this charge against the Diocesan Boards of what is really wholesale jobbery in connection with public funds committed to their care, is a monstrous allegation, which should be followed up by specific data. It is not a charge to be lightly made, and I hope the right hon. Baronet will either follow up his allegation with specific instances, or withdraw a charge which ought never to have been made, particularly in this House, against a body of men who have fulfilled a great public duty, merely on published accounts——

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: The hon. and learned Member says, "particularly in this House." If the implication is that the charge has not been made in the locality, I may say that I made it in the locality a year and a half ago.

Mr. CRIPPS: If the right hon. Baronet did so make it, he ought to be the more prepared with specific data. The right hon. Baronet not only charged the Diocesan Boards with jobbery, but he charged corruption of the worst kind, in my opinion, against the Government. He stated that the Government had controlled the decision in the Cockerton case; in other words, that the Government had intervened, as a Government, and interfered with the decision of the Court.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I did not use that phrase, and if the hon. and learned Member is about to found an argument upon it, he had better take the phrase I did use. What I said was that the result of that judgment was under their control.

Mr. CRIPPS: I took down the words of the right hon. Baronet. If he withdraws them, well and good, but they were that the Government "controlled" the Cockerton judgment.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I said that the result of that judgment was under their control.

Mr. CRIPPS: If the right hon. Baronet says that that is what he meant I need not go further into the matter. But I do not wish to bandy words on a point of this kind. I took down that the judgment—that is, the opinion of the Court—had been influenced or controlled by the Executive Government.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Oh no.

Mr. CRIPPS: Then what does the right hon. Baronet mean when he talks about the control of the Cockerton judgment by the Government? What is done after a judgment of that kind is a matter of policy, and men may agree or disagree with it. If that is what the right hon. Baronet means, I have no fault to find with what he said, but his words conveyed not only to me, but to others, an entirely different meaning. If that is withdrawn——

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I do not withdraw anything. I adhere to what I said, but I certainly did not mean that, and I am under a strong impression that I did not say it.

MR. CRIPPS: Any way, I took down the words at the time. Then there was a statement with regard to the teachers' houses which I did not follow. Does the right hon. Baronet imply that those houses, or any of them, have been constructed as a charge on the rates, or that since 1870 they have been constructed out of any charge on or loan from the National Exchequer?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I referred to an extinguished School Board district, into which parishes had been brought to make a sufficiently large area for rating purposes. Some of those parishes have never derived any benefit from the school, the school being in a distant parish, but they will have to bear a liability for building the house.

MR. CRIPPS: I will deal with that, but it is an entirely different point. That is a question which may be argued as to the adjustment of rating liability between different parishes or districts. But I understood the right hon. Baronet to say that the exception of teachers' houses was peculiarly inadvisable, because, in many cases, those houses had been built out of a charge upon the rates.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The case I was putting was of exactly the nature I have just described, viz., a couple of rural parishes in a School Board; they have to bear a liability, from which they have never derived any benefit, and they will have to pay not only for the building but also for the school-house. I said that the hardness of the case was there shown by the fact that although they gave the buildings to the country they got no rent for them, whereas the voluntary school managers would get a rent for the schoolmasters' houses.

MR. CRIPPS: Then I quite misunderstood the right hon. Baronet's statement and argument. As regards the distribution between the county area and the minor area, that, of course, is a matter upon which we may have differences of opinion. But that is quite a different question from the allegation which has been more than once made in this House, viz., that these teacher's houses for which a rent will in future have to be paid, if they belong to denominational bodies, have been constructed out of a charge on the ratepayers. I absolutely deny that that is a fact. Since 1870 there has not been a farthing of charge on the taxpayers in connection with teachers' houses.

Now, Sir, I will say a word or two in reference to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman, in his amiable way, summed up the views of the Opposition against the proposals of the Government. His first allegation was that there was a necessary antithesis between what he called a national and a denominational system. Apart from the play upon words, I might appeal on this point to what has been said several times from the Benches opposite. There is no antithesis. Here, however, we come to the question we have discussed, viz., whether the particular proposal of the Government for the incorporation of the denominational into the national system is in itself a wise and good measure, but that is an entirely different matter. It is a misapprehension, at the very outset, to treat these two points as necessarily inconsistent. They were made consistent in 1870 by the Liberal Government of the day, they have been carried on as consistent ever since, and I thought it was more or less common ground that any national system must comprehend the denominational system, having regard to the history of education in this country.

The next statement of the right hon. Gentleman was, I thought, rather one of prejudice, viz., that questions had arisen as to the respective parts laymen and clerics should play in national education, and that he was wholly for the laymen. That was a very bold way of describing what the point of discussion has been. I think that almost every one who has followed the arguments has come to the conclusion that you must have both the lay and the clerical element in education, and that the question is simply as to the relative share that each should take. I have always been opposed to "one-man management," and I welcome this Bill because it introduces into what are really private schools a local representative element. It has been supposed that some Members on this side want to destroy or diminish the element of lay management. That is not the case except within the region of doctrine, which has been especially preserved to one class under the trust deeds. I do not believe there is a single Member who desires to turn the lay element out of the managing body as regards public elementary education. They simply desire that questions of doctrine should not be at the will of—not a representative body in the true sense of the term, but of a body of casually appointed laymen.

The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition then referred to what is sometimes called the constitutional question—that where you have public expenditure you ought to have public control. There, again, I do not believe a single Member on this side of the House disagrees with that general proposition. The question is whether the Bill gives a fair measure of public control as regards public expenditure. On that point there has been a great deal of misapprehension, and I should like to say a few words on what I consider to be the true basis and theory by which to test whether or not you have a proper control in relation to the public expenditure. To begin with, it seems to be forgotten that, whatever the proportions may be, you get your funds partly from the National Exchequer and partly from rates. The funds which come from the National Exchequer are safeguarded from this House through the Education Department, who, through their inspectors, see that the requirements of the Code, for which this House is responsible, are carried out. It is just the same as regards every grant made by this House for the purposes of local expenditure. Our one and only security is the control we have over the spending Department, whether it is the Board of Education, the Home Office, or any other, who act through their various inspectors. The portion of the expenditure which in future will be provided for the denominational schools, in reference to which the question of public control arises, is therefore that which comes from the rates. What are the conditions as regards the rates? I admit that it is impossible to make a very accurate estimate as regards the future, but the best estimate of the charge upon the rates is that it will not exceed one-sixth or one-seventh of the whole expenditure on voluntary schools under the Bill. In respect of that expenditure, you not only get the entire local control, as regards secular education, but even as regards education which is not secular—that is, in the general management — you get one-third representation. The challenge I make is this. It is no good talking about the control of the representation. If I am right in my contention that only one-sixth or one-third of the expenditure of denominational schools be thrown upon the rates, and if in respect of that you give the ratepayers one-third of the management as regards religious education, I want to know have I established my proposition that under this Bill you give a complete and a more than complete element of public control as regards any question of expenditure? [OPPOSITION laughter.] It is all very well for hon. Members opposite to laugh, but I challenge them as regards the argument. I challenge them to say what principle they suggest to give a larger element of public control as regards expenditure. I know that hon. Members opposite would like to do away with denominational bodies altogether. I will not go back upon this argument, for it has been argued again and again, and if those in favour of denominational education have not made their position absolutely certain up to this point, it is no good arguing the matter any further. Assuming that you maintain denominational education, and assuming that the question is whether you give a sufficient measure of representative control to the ratepayers, there is no answer to what I say—that you give a far larger measure of representation than ought to be given as regards any possible expenditure that will occur under this Bill.

There is one other matter with which the right hon. Gentleman dealt, and upon which I should like to say one or two words before I sit down. Apart from this control of expenditure, I want to deal with what has been said as regards public control from the point of view of public representation on the management only. I must say that I think the right hon. Gentleman cannot have appreciated in what he said how matters of local government are managed, not only in our counties but in county boroughs. I will not go into what was said by the right hon. Gentleman who represents the Local Government Board. It is notorious that the whole tendency of local self-government in this country has been towards concentration and uniformity, whether you take the parish constable or the parish road or the poor law. In every direction you have had this same system of concentration upon particular bodies, and therefore these bodies must act through committees. What does the right hon. Gentleman mean as regards the absence of representative control because you act through committees or sub-committees?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But they are not committees of elected members.

Mr. CRIPPS: Let me deal with the right hon. Gentleman's two points. As regards their not being a committee of elected members, that is nothing more than a question of administration. As a matter of fact, under this Bill as it stands every single member of the local education authority might be a member of the representative body. I do not know how far this tendency will be carried out, but we have the analogy of the committees under the Technical Instruction Acts. This only means that you reinforce your representative element by an expert element; and what has been found as a matter of practical administration is that you get better results if you have an elected element and an expert element as well. I go further, and say that if you are to take most of the views expressed by progressive Members on the other side of the House as regards municipal government, they all agree upon this, because they have expressed the opinion more than once that the best way of ensuring efficient municipal representative government is not merely by trusting to the representative element alone, but also by including the expert or special representative. In this particular case you may introduce it or not, and I should have thought that the right hon. Gentleman opposite might have trusted local representative bodies on this point to carry out their duties in the best possible administrative manner. I am one of those who always very much regretted that the general principle of uniformity has been impaired by the special treatment of urban and borough councils, for I have always looked upon that as a limitation which interferes to that extent with the main principle of the Bill. I regret it enormously, but what I want to put is that there is still an enormous advance under this Bill upon the conditions which exist at the present moment. What can be better than to take the parish as the basis of the area for educational purposes, and although under this Bill a borough of a particular size and an urban district of a particular size have been maintained, there is an enormous advance in spreading the local interests as regards education over a far wider area than before. Although I will not use the word "contempt" I do say that I think the right hon. Gentleman used somewhat contemptuous language in regard to this principle in the Bill.

I speak from the experience I have had upon this educational question, and from the knowledge I have of the popularity of this Bill in the great industrial centres of the North. [Opposition laughter]. There is no county in which this Bill is so popular as in the great manufacturing county of Lancashire. There is no county and no County Council which has received this Bill in the same spirit as Lancashire, although the County Council in Lancashire is under the leadership of a gentleman who does not agree with the Government in political matters, but who at the same time is one of the greatest educational experts—I allude to Sir John Hibbert. This Bill has been received in this way in Lancashire because it has co-ordinated education, and it is an extraordinary argument to put forward at this stage of the Bill, as has been put forward by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that this measure in any way interferes with what everyone who is in favour of this Bill had looked upon as the element which they cared most about, namely, that it will enable the poor child to start at the bottom of the education ladder, and, if his abilities justify it, he will be provided with secondary education right up to the university. Upon this point I do repudiate most strongly the suggestions made from the opposite side that there is something of the obscurantist element in this Bill. If I thought it was not for the advantage of education—and the main point is after all whether it is a good educational measure or not—if I did not believe that from an educational point of view this is a great and a most beneficial educational reform, I should not have supported it so cordially as I admit I have always done both in this House and outside.

It is on that ground that our great industrial centres of the North are in favour of this Bill, and it is on that ground that the isolated country districts are in favour of it. [OPPOSITION cries of "Leeds."] I am talking about the great industrial centres of Lancashire. [OPPOSITION cries of "Bury."] I will give hon. Gentlemen opposite what they can make out of matters of that kind. I understand their opposition to be not on the main lines of the Bill, but on incidental matters which are not educational matters, which have been introduced into the discussion of a great educational question. In undertaking any great and statesmanlike reform in matters upon which the people feel deeply, I willingly admit that a Government must risk popularity. I honour the Government because they have done this. Apart from matters of important details, upon which I have expressed my difference of opinion with the Government, I have cordially supported this measure. But although I feel strongly upon some of these incidental matters, which are of great importance, yet I do feel much more strongly that in its main lines this is a great educational reform which will carry out the purpose for which it has been introduced, and from that point of view this Bill will certainly have my most hearty support on the Third Reading.

*(5.35.) MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I must beg the forgiveness of the House if I rise so early to ask its attention. I know that it is somewhat unusual for a Member so newborn as myself to utter anything more articulate than a cheer; but I have been sent to this House with a message on the Education Bill, so special and direct—from a great industrial centre—that I should not be doing my duty if I did not voice in this House the opposition to this measure which my constituents feel so strongly, and which they have expressed so decisively. The objections which we entertain to this Bill are not, as the hon. Member for Stretford appears to think, merely on incidental matters, but they are objections which go to the very root and centre of the matter. We object to this Bill because it destroys the direct popular control of the people over the people's schools. We object to the Bill because it throws the entire cost of education in the voluntary schools of the country on to public funds while it establishes no complete system of popular control. The hon. Member opposite threw down a challenge to the Opposition. He said that it is clear that the control over these schools is ample in proportion to the payment made from the public funds, but when the teachers are paid entirely out of the rates and taxes how can it be said that the public control is ample when the appointment of those teachers in over 12,000 schools is left to a committee of which two-thirds is in no way representative of the people. You cannot allocate one particular branch of revenues to the teachers, and in future the whole income of the schools, apart from the maintenance of the buildings, will come from public funds, and consequently the teachers will be paid entirely out of public funds in a way in which they have never been paid before. Under these circumstances it is not complete public control to leave the appointment of the teachers in the hands of committees which, by a majority of two-thirds, are wholly unrepresentative.

We object to this Bill because it does not remedy the grievances of Nonconformists in single school areas, and because it imposes sectarian tests upon teachers in 12,000 schools in this country, in which practically no Nonconformist will ever be able to obtain a post as a schoolmaster or schoolmistress. What is the defence offered for these restrictions?

It is that the voluntaryists provide the school buildings, and in cases where there are no fees, no endowments, and no teachers' houses, they will also have to pay the cost of repairs. Let me put an illustration. Suppose, for the sake of argument that the Roman Catholic community in this country was a very wealthy community and suppose they had offered to build national schools for elementary education throughout the country, but on the condition that all the teachers should be Roman Catholics, and that no religious instruction should be given in those schools except Roman Catholic instruction. Would hon. Members opposite have been prepared to accept such an offer as that? I think they would realise at once that the terms were preposterous; and yet when they propose precisely the same terms themselves, in regard to 12,000 schools, for the Nonconformists of England, they are surprised and astonished that the Nonconformists rise in revolt against such terms.

Would it have been impossible, after all, to have arrived at some new and larger compromise on this question which would have ended once and for all this long wrangle, this lamentable quarrel, which for sixty years has kept the Churches apart, and has so often prevented this House from doing its full duty to the children of the nation? What is it that hon. Members opposite specially desire? It is that the children should have the right to be instructed in the religious doctrines of their parents. Would it have been impossible for us to have conceded that claim? What do we desire on our side? That there should be a national system of education under complete popular control, that there should be equal rights for all sects and no religious tests for the teachers. Would it have been impossible for hon. Members opposite in return to have conceded this to us? Why would it have been so difficult to have introduced a measure transferring, on equitable terms, these voluntary schools to popular control and placing them on the footing of provided schools; giving in them the fullest possible liberty for religious instruction; allowing the teachers themselves to impart non-sectarian religious teaching; allowing ministers of religion, or others nominated by them, to enter the schools and give at the cost of the denominations the definite religious instruction the parents of the children specially desire, and at the same time allowing those parents who did not wish to have any religious instruction given to their children the opportunity of withdrawing them under the Conscience Clause. It would not pass the wit of man, or that highest form of the wit of man, the ingenuity of Cabinet Ministers, to elaborate a scheme of this character. It is no new scheme. It has been said that the system of education in our colonies is entirely secular and undenominational. I find, however, that not only are ordinary Scripture lessons given, but facilities are afforded for special religious teachers to enter the schools to give such denominational instruction as the parents desire their children to receive. In New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania, Manitoba, Ontario, and New Brunswick, the State gives undenominational religious instruction while allowing these facilities to each denomination; in Queensland and New Zealand the State limits itself to secular teaching, but allows the same facilities. There is a similar system in some of the German States, in Hungary, and in Ireland.

It is said that the cost of purchasing the voluntary schools would make the scheme impossible, but that cost at the outside would not entail a loan that would bring an interest charge of more than half a million a year. It has been urged from this side of the House that it would be impossible to secure teachers to come in from the outside to give adequate religious instruction, but this proposal would supply an automatic test as to how far definite dogmatic instruction was really desired. If the denominations were not willing to pay capable teachers to come in and give the instruction, it would prove that that instruction was not desired. It has been urged, also, with great force, that the children would be divided into various denominational camps, and penned up in various theological folds. But is it seriously imagined that every Nonconformist child, who goes to a Nonconformist Sunday school, is not aware that he is a Nonconformist? Every Roman Catholic child knows from its earliest years that it belongs to the Catholic body and not to the Protestant body, and similarly with other denominations. My right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen urged that, after all, this dogmatic teaching was unnecessary, and that the virtues could be inculcated without specific denominational instruction. That is also my own view, but I do not think the State is entitled to say that. The State has no right to declare how much or how little dogmatic teaching is necessary for the formation of character. This House is not a synod, and those who hold Disestablishment views should be the first to proclaim that Parliament is incompetent to say exactly what particular religious principles persons should hold and should be taught. As a Liberal, I wish to see the greatest possible liberty given for all sorts of religious beliefs to be taught, even in the schools paid for by the State. I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick, and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon have declared themselves in favour of this, and even the General Committee of the Free Church Council has declared that it would be willing to accept this scheme as a compromise.

I am profoundly convinced that it is only upon those lines that a settlement of this question will ultimately come. You cannot abolish tests for teachers; you cannot abolish sectarian management; you cannot abolish the denominational system of training colleges, unless you undenominationalise the voluntary schools, and I believe that in practice it will be found impossible to throw the voluntary schools into the general national system unless you at the same time give the right of entry to other religious bodies. But this is not the scheme of this Bill. This is a Bill saturated through and through, from beginning to end, with the very essence of the spirit of sectarianism. And it is a Bill which has been introduced in response to no public demand. I know that some discredit has been cast on the doctrine of the mandate. It is indeed impossible to say that a Government shall never introduce a measure which has not been formally before the country at a General Election; but, on the other hand, a Government has no right to introduce a measure which deeply divides the nation after a General Election which had been specifically limited to another issue. If a Liberal Government had been elected on some question of foreign policy and had used its power to force through a measure, let us say, for the disestablishment of the Church, would not hon. Members on the other side have been the first to cry out and to say that it was a gross abuse of Constitutional usage? The speeches of the Colonial Secretary have been quoted to prove how closely the issue of the last general election was limited to the question of the South African War. But, after all, his speeches can always be quoted on either side in any controversy. The same has been said of Holy Scripture. There, however, the resemblance ends. I go to the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury himself. Again and again he told the country that on the South African War alone was the judgment of the nation to be given. In his election address he declared—

> "Every citizen is bound to dismiss all smaller issues."

In one of his first speeches in Manchester he said—

> "He was anxious that on his first appearance before his constituents not a word should escape him on any collateral subject which should suggest the possibility that there was any other and smaller issue before them than the great question on which the country was required to express its verdict."

Again he said in Manchester—

> "This is the solitary issue of importance before the constituencies."

And in his last speech he declared—

> "The poll to-morrow did not turn on any of the old questions which had previously divided the electors. It was a new issue, to be governed by new considerations."

I have read through with some industry all his speeches during the general election as reported in *The Times*, but I cannot find one single speech, nor one paragraph in his election address, in which the smallest reference is made to the giving of rate aid, or to giving aid of any sort, to the voluntary schools of this country.

The hon. Member for the Stretford Division, who spoke last, said that this Bill is very popular in the great centres of industry, although, almost in the same breath, he declared that the Government had risked their popularity in introducing it. There is only one way in which the popularity or unpopularity of a measure can be shown, and that is by the votes of the people themselves. There have been since this Bill was introduced six elections in various parts of the country, from the extreme south up to those islands in the north where sea-sick candidates wander disconsolately from rock to rock. [AN HON. MEMBER: Devonport.] I am including Devonport, where the circumstances, however, were exceptional and peculiar, and where questions of Imperial politics are sometimes subordinated to somewhat sordid interests. In those six constituencies the Conservative poll has been decreased by 10 per cent., and the Liberal poll, on the other hand, has been increased by 40 per cent. The total Conservative poll was reduced from 31,400 to 27,800, while the total Liberal poll was increased from 22,800 to 31,500. If that shows that this Bill has been popular in the country I am at a loss to know how unpopularity can be shown.

This is a Bill, also, which has been forced through this House by the exceptional use of the Closure. I have been carefully through the Bill, and I find that it contains, to be precise, just 637 lines, of which no fewer than 184, or not far short of a third, have been passed through the House without a single minute's debate, without the slightest opportunity for discussion or for one solitary Amendment to be moved. Not only that, but the nine pages of Schedules, which contain a large number of important provisions which have attracted a great deal of attention throughout the country, have been passed also without being at all before the attention of this House. If it is said that the debates have been protracted, let it be remembered that, though in form one Bill, it is not in reality one Bill at all. It is three Bills merged and amalgamated into one. It is a Bill to revolutionise the system of primary education and to abolish the School Boards; it is a Bill to establish a system of secondary education, or rather to allow others to establish a system of secondary education; and, in the third place, it is a Bill to give rate aid on certain terms to the voluntary schools. All these proposals are more or less distinct from one another, and each needed, and should have had, considerable debate.

This measure is introduced in response to no public demand; it is resisted with great intensity by a large section of the nation; and it has been forced through this House by the use of the Closure. It presents as clear a case as could be presented for action by the Second Chamber. If ever there was a case in which the Second Chamber was justified in rejecting a Bill passed through this House I venture to say this is the occasion. But when Conservatives are in office we have no Second Chamber. For all practical purposes the House of Lords disappears; the Constitution is a single-chamber Constitution; the House of Lords hibernates, and though it may growl in its sleep when stirred by the bishops, it does not awake to resume its destructive activities until a Liberal Ministry is once more in power. This Bill, of course, will pass through the other House with practically no difficulty. The provisions it contains for secondary education will stand. But I am profoundly convinced that the time is not distant when the work with regard to voluntary schools will have to be undone, and that a new settlement on other lines will have to be undertaken. Hon. Members opposite as well as ourselves, I feel sure, must deplore the fact that after these prolonged debates this question of denominational education still remains as one of the unsolved questions before the country. All who realise —as I, for one, fully realise—how much vice, how much crime, how much immorality there are in this country of ours, how potent and how active are the forces that make for evil, who also realise the need for genuine unity and harmony among the various Churches of the country in combating those evils, must all the more deplore that this Bill does nothing to remove, but rather accentuates, the antagonism on this question that has so long existed between the Churches. There can be no cordial harmony, no true unity between the Churches, so long as one is given privileges at the expense of the rest, and so long as education, which should be a national concern, is left to be a battlefield between contending sects.

(5.58.) MR. WANKLYN (Bradford, Central): May I be permitted to offer my congratulations to the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, on the ability he has shown in his speech? I can say for myself that I have derived great pleasure from the perusal of his book on "Liberalism." I have never found my own grievance in regard to the existing order of things better put than in the book of which the hon. Gentleman is the author. He says—

> "In two-thirds of the country Board schools and voluntary schools exist side by side, and those who wish their children to be given denominational teaching have not only to pay the School Board rates, but to subscribe to the schools of their own sect as well. Their position is much the same as that of the Dissenters in the days of Church rates, whom conscience compelled to give to the chapel, and law compelled also to give to the Church."

I read the book with much interest when it was published, and also the preface written by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. I am glad to be able to state that I find myself in agreement with much that the hon. Member has said in his speech, but on the particular question of rate aid I join absolute issue with him.

The main prejudice has arisen against this Bill, I think, in connection with authorship. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean, in opening his speech, ascribed the authorship of the Bill to Convocation, and generally the authorship has been ascribed to the bishops. The Prime Minister has said more than once that there is no bargain between him and the bishops. Canon MacColl, a life-long friend of Mr. Gladstone, has informed us in a pamphlet he has just published that Convocation was not the author of the Bill. The hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs has done me the honour to suggest that I am the author of the Bill. I may be allowed on the Third Reading to congratulate the hon. Member for Carnarvon on the manner in which he has led the opposition to the Bill, but I cannot claim to be myself the author of it. But while I cannot claim the authorship of it, I can let in a little light on that subject. I was asked by one of the authors of the Bill last year—"What would Bradford think, and what would Bradford like?" And my answer was that Bradford would like a Bill based on the Memorandum of Mr. Forster to the Cabinet, dated 21st October, 1869. That Memorandum opened with the statement—

> "We must supplement and not supplant,"

and went on—

> "Our object, then, is to supplement the present voluntary system—that is, to fill up its gaps at least cost of public money, with least loss of voluntary co-operation. I, therefore, now look with most hope . . . to compulsory school provision, if and where necessary, but not otherwise; . . . but it seems to me impossible . . . unless we divide the country into districts."

In his speech in the following year in this House, Mr. Forster said—

> "Well, the electoral body we have chosen for the towns is the Town Council. In the country we have taken the best body we could find—the vestry."

At that time, of course, the County Councils were not in existence. The Vice President of the Council has told us that he feared the idea of putting the supreme control of secondary education into the hands of the County Councils was not an original idea of any member of the Government, but it was based on Mr. Forster's proposal, which I have just read to the House. The Bill supplements and does not supplant. Next, it places the supreme control of secular education in the hands of the City Councils and the County Councils, and it follows Mr. Forster's views in another step. Mr. Forster had absolute confidence in the City Councils, and he said he would leave the nomination of the sub-committee to them, with full power of cooptation. "You cannot," said Mr. Forster, "if you put power into the hands of these local bodies, trust them too much." Now I come to the crucial point of rates, and when I am taunted with being singular, it is singular to me how few Members on either side of the House recollect that Mr. Forster always advocated rate-aid to voluntary schools. I am sure that will not be questioned by the Member for North Camberwell, because he knows the education question so thoroughly, and he will recollect, probably, that Mr. Forster, in 1868, introduced himself, with Mr. Bruce, a Bill into this House giving full rate-aid to voluntary schools. Mr. Forster's argument was given in these words—

> "It is not unfair to levy a rate on a Roman Catholic for the secular education of a Methodist. But if the ratepayers give aid to schools they should do so impartially—if to any, then to all efficient schools, whether denominational or secular."

And in a letter to Mr. John Bright of October, 1871, he wrote as follows—

> "The power to assist the voluntary schools out of the rates, greatly objected to by the Nonconformists, was omitted."

But Mr. Forster himself, I have reason to think, never saw objections to rate-aid to voluntary schools. His original proposal was set out in the words I have read to the House, but it was watered down subsequently. Finally, Mr. Gladstone dealt with the difficulty by giving an extra grant from the Exchequer in lieu of rate-aid, but that grant from the Exchequer, of course, in a very short time became of no more value than the threepenny rate of Mr. Forster. With the growth of demands in the increasing standard in which we all rejoice, that grant in aid became of no more value than the threepenny rate, and so we had the measure of 1897 giving the voluntary schools more assistance. And now what has the Government done? Ministers have reverted to this Memorandum of Mr. Forster of October, 1869, and they have boldly put all schools, as he suggested, on the rates also with regard to secular education. It has always seemed to me unfair to penalise the majority for the prejudices of the minority. If we tax and rate a Jew for the teaching of the New Testament, are we to deprive the Jews of the right to teach the tenets of their own faith? If we tax and rate a Roman Catholic for what most of them regard as a moral monster, undenominational teaching, are we to deprive the Roman Catholic of his right to teach his faith in schools? I made a speech in this House in 1897, in which I said, and I was only echoing the words of Mr. Forster, that every school must comply with the requirements of the Education Department, and, subject to the Conscience Clause, had the right of demanding full aid from the taxes, the rates, or the public. This measure is Mr. Forster's Memorandum brought up to date, with the grievances of Gentlemen opposite removed to the best of our ability. We must all agree that one-man control has gone for ever, and I for one am not sorry.

There is a curious historical parallel, which I might touch upon before I sit down, between this Bill and the Bill of 1870. The same arguments, the same literature, the same meetings, the same banners, the same leagues, and the same men, have opposed this measure, as opposed Mr. Forster's Bill. In my own constituency Mr. Alfred Illingworth was one of the first men in Bradford who opposed the Bill of Mr. Forster. Mr. Alfred Illingworth has been the chief opponent of this Bill today. Mr. Alfred Illingworth founded in 1896 the Northern Counties Education League, which has taken the place of the well-known Birmingham League of 1870, and he invited Mr. Hirst Hollowell to take the place of Mr. Miall. When the Bill of 1870 was made an Act, Mr. Forster was treated by his constituents to a vote of censure, and he told them they would live to thank him for his Act. North Leeds has passed a vote of censure on the Government, and on that analogy North Leeds will live to thank the Government. If that is considered doubtful in my own constituency —I do not speak for Bradford as a whole —in the recent municipal elections three seats out of four were won by supporters of this measure. One seat was lost by a reduced majority. The next seat was fought by a Wesleyan supporter of the Bill. That was won against a loss last year. We won another seat lost last year, and we won a third which we had not won before in my time. Mr. Forster, in his wisdom and in his courage, brought into existence the Bill of 1870. In their courage and wisdom, the Prime Minister and the Duke of Devonshire have brought in this Bill, and we thank them for it. Mr. Forster went through a fire of affliction which shortened his days. He was subjected to a most relentless opposition amounting to persecution. The Prime Minister and the Duke of Devonshire knew what they have to face, and I say they deliberately faced that opposition which they knew would arise in connection with these proposals. They were wise and courageous, and we thank them for carrying Mr. Forster's system into a great scheme of national education. One section of Gentlemen opposite advocate a purely secular system of education, another section advocate an undenominational form in national schools, and all sections are agreed that they would do their best to repeal this Bill. We on the Government side claim that we have been the pioneers in the cause of education, and we have always been in the past. Will hon. Gentlemen opposite question the fact that the Church of England rejected anything that might be called a national system, or deny that the great Liberal Unionist, Mr. Forster, took the great step, or that we on the Government side have been pioneers in the cause of education? We believe with the late Dr. Dale that undenominational teaching is positively dangerous. We believe that education, unless based on definite religious teaching, to use Dr. Dale's words, is dangerous and mischievous. We hold that belief, and on these issues we are prepared to join and to fight to the last.

(6.15.) SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford. N.): I am asked by some of my old constituents to vote for this Bill, and therefore I may perhaps be excused if I say a few words upon it. I approach this matter from a different standpoint from those who have addressed themselves to the debate, in so far that I approach it from the point of view of the way in which it concerns the Roman Catholics of this country. I do not pretend to be an authority upon English educational matters, but it does seem to me that this Bill does not confer upon the Roman Catholic schools of this country benefits which it might confer without in any way trenching on the principle of the Bill or interfering with the advantages which the Opposition have gained in the course of these debates. Having said so much, the House, I am sure, will allow me to deal with one or two points that occur to me in connection with this Bill, in so far as it relates to the Roman Catholic schools in this country. Under the Bill as it now stands I take objection to the circumstance that the power of appeal by the managers of Roman Catholic schools from the decisions of the local authority to the Board of Education is very seriously diminished, if not taken away altogether. That may or may not be an important matter, but it is conceivable that it may be a very important matter, and injustice may be done to these schools. I hope, therefore, in another place to which this Bill will shortly go, it may be possible to widen the operation of the power of the managers of those Roman Catholic Schools. I think it is Clause 5 which provides for the management of the schools. Under that Clause Roman Catholic schools may be compelled to use text books opposed, or at least, hostile to their religion, and in view of that the House will realise that there is something in my contention that Roman Catholic managers should have some wider power with regard to the books to be used in the schools. I do not ask that they should be allowed in any way to use inferior books, or that a lower grade of education should be admitted in those schools than is permitted in others, but I ask that they should not be compelled to use text books to which they conscientiously object. In this matter of the selection of text books the Roman Catholic managers ought to have an appeal to the Board of Education. At all events I, think the Government should not allow the existing text books to be taken away unless some very serious reason is shown for it.

I think also that under this Bill the financial position of the Roman Catholic schools generally is not so good as it might have been made. This Bill imposes upon the Roman Catholic managing body the whole cost of school repairs. In former years the Roman Catholic bodies were enabled to charge the cost to the school account, and to make a charge for rent in respect of their schools, and they were reimbursed that expense out of the grant by the Government. Under this Bill as it now stands these schools are no longer in a position to do this, and I hope the Government will reconsider their financial position. The Roman Catholics represent the poorest part of the community, and the voluntary tax upon them for the support of their schools has been far more heavy upon them than upon any other section, and in view of the fact that they are a poor and small section of the community, I hope the House will deal with this question in a large-minded and generous manner, and show more consideration than has been accorded to them. They have, I think, a good claim, because they have made enormous sacrifices to teach their religion in their own way. With regard to Section 3 of Clause 7, I think that may prove extremely dangerous, so far as

Roman Catholics are concerned, as it might be used to make the position of these schools intolerable by the placing of a Protestant pupil teacher in a Roman Catholic school. In such schools there would be strong objection to the appointment of a pupil teacher who was not a member of the Roman Catholic religion; and, in my opinion, this Section might lead to considerable inconvenience, which I should be desirous myself to obviate.

Sub-Section 4 — the Kenyon-Slaney Clause—which raised so much discussion, requires a certain amount of explanation, and we Roman Catholics can only appreciate what it means when we see that we shall have managers in our schools who do not belong to the Roman Catholic community. We should much object to anything of that kind, and protest in the strongest possible manner; and, inasmuch as the managers would control religious education in the schools, it would be a most extraordinary position to have a Protestant manager in a Roman Catholic school. I do not know whether this can be remedied, but it is a very serious matter. I do not think you would ever get Roman Catholics to agree to a thing of this kind. What I would suggest to the Government is that another Section should be added to this Clause, to the effect that Sections 3 and 4, Clause 7, should not apply to the Roman Catholic religion. That would be the best way out of the difficulty, so far as the Roman Catholic schools are concerned. I press this upon the Government because of the extremely important matters which these Sections raise. There are other matters in this Bill which are not satisfactory, which will no doubt be opposed by the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, but I hope these points to which I have called attention, when they do come before the Government in another place, will receive favourable consideration. The two points I have raised seem to me to be points of very great importance, and I venture to press them on the Government. In conclusion, I can only say I was asked to support this Bill, and I do so, because it was conceived to be to the benefit of the Roman Catholics in this country.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I do not know what to admire most—the courage of the Government in admitting their misfortune in having to deal with it, or the way in which they have dealt with this question of education, which has absorbed so much of their time. It is a question which arouses such very strong feeling and contains so much contentious matter that I should not have been surprised if the Government had left it alone. I remember the contest waged in 1870, and the way in which Mr. Forster promoted the interests of the children and secured for them the benefits of education. I remember also the Bill of 1896, and the number of Amendments which were put down at the time the Government decided to withdraw it. I remember the vehement opposition offered in 1897 to the attempt to do some justice to the voluntary schools, to enable them to hold their own against the fierce competition which they had to face. And remembering all these things, I doubted whether the Government would have undertaken this Bill. I felt it needed a Forster's courage to face the question, but I confess I did not know the Prime Minister then as I know him now. By his grasp and knowledge of the question, and his readiness to consider all points urged upon him, from whatever side they came, and his determination also to carry the measure upon the lines upon which he first introduced it, the Prime Minister has merited the thanks of all.

The right hon. Gentleman has kept to the front three points which were the main features of the Bill when it went into Committee, and which are its main features now—namely, the harmonising and improving of education by bringing schools hitherto deficient up to the requisite standard of efficiency; the placing of secular education throughout the country under popular control; and the preservation of the denominational character of schools hitherto called voluntary. As to the first two points I need not say much; they have been urged with great ability on either side, but I think the combining of the spending authority with the rating authority and centralising in that body all the best functions of muncipal life is an ideal worthy of being aimed at, and one that will not prove itself impossible of accomplishment, especially when there is to be called to the aid of these educational committees experts from outside, who will add great strength to these counties. Dignity and independence ought to be added to municipal life by the new duties cast upon the municipal bodies. No doubt the question of whether the areas are too large will have to be considered, and there are many things that remain doubtful; but the scheme of the Bill is an ideal worthy of being aimed at. As to the question of putting the schools largely under popular control, there has been expressed tonight the greatest difference of opinion as to the efficacy of that. It is admitted that in regard to the teachers the educational authority can veto an unsatisfactory appointment, secure the dismissal of a teacher who is not up to the mark in educational matters, and have the power of the purse to withhold all grants of money, and the power to compel by *mandamus*, and by appointing two of their own body on the management, to see that their orders are effectually carried out.

It is upon the third point, the reserving of the denominational character of the schools, that the chief controversy has centred. Other points of difference might have been agreed upon, but the differences here appear to me to be irreconcilable. The Prime Minister in introducing the Bill was not prepared, as some on the other side of the House would have liked to see him, to confiscate the schools or to buy them—in fact they have never been for sale. The right hon. Gentleman recognised that in any scheme these schools must be placed in a position worthily to play a necessary and inevitable part in the scheme of national education. This came as a most bitter surprise to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had begun to hope for the extinction of the voluntary schools. Immense surprise has been felt at the way in which those schools have multiplied since the board schools were established. Some parallel in the matter is to be found in what happened in Egypt a few years ago. Egypt had been in a state of anarchy and bankruptcy, and no one would put it to rights jointly with England. England, therefore, had to step in and do the thing herself. No sooner was England securely established there, than the greatest jealousy was excited; those who had refused to undertake the responsibility now wanted to share it with England, and asked to be admitted to partnership, and it seemed for a time that we should be obliged to give way in that direction. This appears to be very analogous to what happened when the Church stepped in and created the voluntary schools, doing what no one else would do—with the exception of the British schools and a few Roman Catholic schools. The Church stepped in, practically covering the land with voluntary schools, and thereby brought upon herself a reward of honour which had and always would inure to her. Those who might have done the same have been ever since anxious to get rid of or to supplant the denominational system by schools provided out of the rates. But we hope that by this Bill the position which the voluntary schools rightly hold will be maintained.

The tremendous opposition against the Bill has, I am afraid, been stimulated by statements of the wildest character, and some of absolute inaccuracy. The fears of Nonconformists have been appealed to. A letter in *The Times* newspaper today quotes from the quarterly paper of the Primitive Methodists, in which their people are advised "to do your best to kill the Bill, for the Bill is meant to kill us." To think that anyone would be insane enough to introduce a Bill intended to kill Nonconformity! Nonconformity has stood for a great many years, and I hope it will continue to stand and bring out its sturdy Protestant qualities for a great many years more. But for governing bodies to appeal in this way to the fears of their people seems unworthy of the great traditions of Nonconformity. Appeals have also been made to cupidity. The most barefaced statements have been made that the Bill is to endow the Church and put large sums of money into her pocket. I believe the Church will have a very hard bargain, and that nothing but the greatest sacrifice on the part of her supporters and adherents will suffice to enable the voluntary schools to be carried on in view of the demands likely to be made upon them by the local authority. Then appeals have been made to Protestantism. In the same manifesto to which I have already alluded, the Bill is spoken of as "a determined attempt to capture the children for the priests." The hon. Member for the South Division of Lincolnshire has put his name to a letter, in which, after quoting manuals which are practically Romish and go against the sentiments of every true Member of the Church of England, he says that—

> "At least three-fourths of the clergy profess the doctrines and practise the ritual enjoined in these repulsive priestly manuals."

On behalf of the Church of England, I heartily contradict any such statement. There are a few, I am sorry to say, who so disgrace their cloth; but to say that three-fourths of the clergy profess these doctrines and practise this ritual is a gross exaggeration.

Again, it was said, even by the hon. Member for the Launceston Division, that the children of Nonconformists were being handed over to new ecclesiastical rulers. It seems to me that the man who made such a statement must have been in a balloon. The children have been under these rulers and under one-man management for a great many years, and yet how very few instances of hardship and objectionable practices have been brought to light! There have been one or two cases, and they have been made to do duty again and again, but under these new local managers such cases will be impossible in the future. It has been a bitter experience to me to find myself, on this occasion, opposed to men with whom on so many points I am in full sympathy. We have many evils outside to fight, and great enemies to resist; in this battle I should like to join my hon. friends opposite, and it is therefore most painful to find myself now in direct conflict with them. But when we are asked to come to terms, as we were by the hon. Member for the Cleveland Division, it seems to me that we are invited to give up everything for which we have hitherto contended. We are to be allowed to retain our schools on condition that they become undenominational, and we are asked to assent to a national undenominational system. An undenominational system in which all Christians agree is in theory most delightful, and in practice it might be often excellent. It may be said that the stubborn vitality of the Church of England schools has had great effect on the advance and maintenance of a high standard of religious teaching in Board Schools; why can we not accept this undenominational teaching? Secular teaching has been carried on in Board Schools, and we have had to pay for it. But when it was a question of the Church of England teaching her form of religion, it has been forbidden. The reason we cannot accept undenominational teaching is that there is about it an uncertainty and a tendency towards indifferentism. We did accept it when introduced as a supplement to another system, but when it is to be made universal and imposed without limitation, carrying with it the prohibition of distinctive teaching, we say once and for all that we cannot for a moment accept an undenominational system. Its teaching is positive; it says things are to be omitted; creeds, sacraments, and catechisms are to be of no account. We believe that undenominational teaching means purely secular teaching, and, therefore, we must resist it. We sometimes hear views of undenominational teaching which sound as though we might almost accept it, but we are indebted to the Leader of the Opposition for a description which shows the real attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and which I will venture to read. Speaking at the Alexandra Palace recently, the right hon. Gentleman said:—

> "We would confine ourselves, as nine-tenths of the Liberals would confine themselves, to secular education, *plus* such moral teaching as would be common to all, and not obnoxious to people who do not come within the range of Christianity."

That is to say, teaching that might be taught to Brahmins, Mohammedans, and, I suppose, even in the Gordon College at Khartoum. That is what we say undenominational teaching is bound to come to, and that is why we resist it. We believe that secular teaching to which undenominational teaching would come would be a disaster to this country more serious than a defeat of our fleets and armies, and would degrade this country from its high position as a Christian State. Therefore we stand to our guns and support this Bill, because it gives denominational teaching a place in the national system which we hope it will long retain.

This Bill has received practically the unanimous support of the Teachers' Convention at Bristol, and therefore it cannot be so absolutely unworkable as has been made out in certain quarters. This Bill offers to the working classes advantages under the co-ordinated system which they have never enjoyed before, and it gives the greatest liberty to Municipal and County Councils to spend what they like on either elementary education, evening classes, or technical education. Therefore this Act constitutes a boon to the working classes which they have never yet had the chance of before, and that, when they realise and appreciate, they will cease to be opponents of this Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition secures the rejection of this Bill, what does he offer us in its place? Suppose this Bill is thrown out, will you get an Education Bill with like advantages introduced within the next twenty years? We have no guidance whatever as to the character that such a Bill would assume, and therefore it is either this Bill or nothing. There is no alternative to this Bill offered by the Opposition, and I trust that now that we are bringing these discussions to a close we shall forget the hard words said about it, and do our best to make it a boon and a blessing to the country.

*(6.50.) MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): We have come almost to the end of a long and memorable Parliamentary struggle, and before proceeding to speak of the reasons which induce me to support the Amendment so ably moved by my right hon. friend, perhaps I may be allowed to say one or two words, which shall not be words of provocation, on the prolonged debates of which the Committee stage of this Bill has been the scene. In the first place, I should like to be allowed as a political opponent to congratulate the Prime Minister on the extraordinary patience which marked his conduct of the earlier stages of the Bill, and the skill, ability, and resource which has marked his share all through the discussions in Committee. Without him this Bill would have had no chance. The Bill itself added to his difficulties enormously. The Bill was a bad Bill, as a Bill, apart from the intrinsic merits, or demerits, of its main provisions. It did not enact what the Government thought it enacted; it was not clear in its provisions. Some of its financial and other provisions were so unfair that the Government altered them as soon as they were pointed out. To complain of waste of time, or, of what *The Times*, with its usual good taste towards political opponents, calls anarchical chatter, and to speak of the time occupied as showing a break-down of the Parliamentary system is mere nonsense.

The Bill was said to be drawn by experts. Where are the experts now? If I were asked for a single proof of Parliamentary efficiency, I should find it in the fact that a few Government supporters, some thirty or forty Liberal Members, were sufficient to absolutely transform and remodel all the most important Clauses, except Closure ones, and finally make a possible final Bill out of an utterly impossible original. The right hon. Gentleman has failed to meet our main objections, and therefore we must oppose the Bill in the final stage; but in regard to those alterations of the machinery of this originally imperfect and defective Bill, he has shown a quickness of perception and a comprehensive grasp of detail which has distinctly raised even the high opinion which Members on both sides already held of his great Parliamentary abilities.

I wish the patience had held out to the end. I wish we could have exhaustively discussed the later as we discussed the earlier Clauses of this Bill. It would have been better for the Bill. And that brings me to my second point, and it is this. This Bill has aroused violent opposition in the country. It has aroused strong antagonism here. If the Opposition had wanted to make sure of the failure of this Bill, they would have confined themselves to wrecking Amendments. They have done nothing of the kind. Where they could not get concessions on the points to which they most object, they have devoted themselves with perfect *bonâ fides*, and in an eminently business-like spirit, to improving the machinery of the Bill, to many of whose provisions they are strongly opposed. So eager have they been in this unwelcome task, that I have sometimes wondered whether such hon. friends of mine as the Members for Carnarvon Boroughs and Mid-Glamorganshire have not begun to develop a sneaking and surreptitious regard for a bantling which was none of their producing, yet which they have borne a conspicuous part in knocking into shape. At any rate, no personal ill-feeling has been produced in this House. I would even go further, and venture to express a hope that some of the threats of permanent ill-feeling and of reprisals in the country made by strong partisans on both sides may be exaggerated. Churchmen objecting to the Kenyon-Slaney sub-Section have threatened to give up their schools. It must be obvious they only play the game of their opponents if they do such a thing. On the other hand, Nonconformists may refuse to pay rates. I desire to compel the individual conscience of no man. But as a matter of tactics, surely if this great Parliamentary struggle means anything, it means that the Liberal Party will amend this Bill when they get a chance. What possible good can it do them if those most in favour of its amendment have sacrificed their rights of citizenship in the meantime by refusing to pay rates?

Now let me turn to the Bill. I am going to say all I can in favour of the Bill because I am not one of those who believe the Bill was "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity." I am quite willing to believe, and have always believed, it was an honest attempt, so far as the Government was concerned, to make a national system of education. I think it fails; but of that more anon. I am only dealing with the intention. This Bill does at a bound what ought to be done by degrees. It destroys excellent and successful institutions with thirty years experience and thirty years record of useful work, and it puts in their place new and comparatively untried bodies. It is a revolution without any excuse for revolution, and it is an example rather of irresponsible Radicalism than of Conservative statesmanship. But when all that is said, if you grant we must have one authority for education (I do not grant it as a present necessity), but probably a majority do, I prefer the municipal authority. So, on the main principle of municipalisation, I am not opposed to the Bill. I admit to the full the necessity of dealing with secondary education. I am not opposed to the plan of the Bill. It is true the plan has been improved. The meagre skeleton of that part of the Bill dealing with secondary education has been clothed with flesh and blood, and galvanised into life. It is still inadequate. But I have no quarrel with the principle of dealing with secondary education in the Bill; here it is constructive, and I should be very sorry if any delay occurred in setting up a local authority to deal with it. Finally, I must admit that the Bill has been enormously improved in Committee. I do not forget certain new alterations put in, after Closure by compartments was carried, which are a very sad example of the narrow and huckstering spirit which certain so-called friends of the Church bring into their consideration of questions of national education. I wonder who these faithful but mistaken friends are? Whoever they are, they are the sorriest friends the Chuch has had for many a long day. But this is by way of parenthesis. My main point is that in spite of these Clauses, clandestinely smuggled into the Bill at the end, the Bill has been greatly improved in Committee. And so we have the Bill enormously altered, and on the whole altered for the better.

I may be asked, why do we now oppose the Bill. My answer, shortly, is this. I would vote for the Third Reading if School Boards were retained in large towns, if the provisions as regards management were fair to the public, if Nonconformists were fairly treated as regards teachers, and the Bill were made workable. The Bill destroys what is good, viz., School Boards in large towns. It is needlessly destructive, for they might have been preserved; but they could not have been usefully maintained under the ridiculous Option Clause of the original Bill. That Clause, the offspring of some tortuous mind, made it possible to maintain School Boards, but enacted that if they were maintained no aid from the rates could be given to voluntary schools. I voted against, and would again vote against, so cruel an option as that. But the Government could, if it had desired, have retained the School Boards. This Bill puts on the new local authority the duty of at once taking over the control of both elementary and secondary education. Now, it is our secondary and higher technical education in which we compare so unfavourably with other countries. Our elementary education could have waited. You have gone far to prevent due attention being paid to the more important secondary education by coupling with it elementary education in our larger counties and boroughs. And all this is being handed over to new and comparatively untried bodies. We are told that the Technical Instruction Committees have done good work. I gladly acknowledge it; but do let us be frank. It is the fashion to say that these Committees have done everything well. They have had little to do and no enemies, for the whisky money they spent came from the taxes. They now will have to deal with secondary education in a comprehensive spirit and at the same time perform the multifarious duties of School Boards and control the secular education of voluntary schools.

I know the official excuse. You must have one authority in order to have co-ordination and correlation. The Cockerton judgment made it necessary. To that I reply that the Cockerton judgment drew a line between elementary and secondary education for the first time and in itself made separate working possible. Further, the cry of "one authority" is a new cry. You did not bring in such a Bill last year, and we never heard a word of "one authority" at the General Election. True statesmanship would have gone slowly—step by step—making sure of the ground—as you proposed last year. I cannot believe that this revolutionary educational leap in the dark is a safe solution of this question.

I shall not discuss at length with, though I must mention, the chief reasons of our opposing the absolute unfairness of the proportion of management given to denominational schools and the consequent unfairness of the position in which Nonconformists who wish to become teachers are placed. The Church gets three-quarters or four-fifths of the head-teachers. It is apologised for in this way. It is said to be the only plan to keep denominational teaching. Well, I dispute that. There are other ways. I content myself by remarking that as one purpose of denominational religious teaching as of undenominational religious teaching, is to inculcate principles of justice and right and fairplay, it is a wrong thing, and an unwise thing, to attempt to preserve denominational teaching by methods which are obviously and admittedly unfair to half the people of England.

One thing these debates have done. They have helped us to clarify our minds, and they have knocked some venerable fictions on the head. The whole claim for denominational education rested in the past on the inalienable right of the parent. Who hears of the inalienable right of the parent now? We implored you to give the parent a deciding voice in the choice of managers. You refused, so that venerable fiction is at last exploded. What then is this inalienable right now? It turns out to be the inalienable right of the Church to educate in denominational doctrine on week days, and at the public expense, the children of parents too lazy to teach religion themselves, or too indifferent to send them to church and Sunday school. In order to do this effectually it is to provide one-twelfth or less of money and to have two-thirds of management. I am willing to leave the fairness of that arrangement to the decision of the English people. They respect the parent, and they respect the Church when she confines herself to her proper sphere; but when they find the claim of the Church extending, as it does in single-school districts, to the inalienable right to teach Nonconformist and Roman Catholics Church doctrine at the public expense, and the inalienable right to have denominational head-teachers in two-thirds of the schools of the country, they cannot fail to see that the position is fundamentally unfair, and what is fundamentally unfair cannot last in this country.

I come now to the last objection I wish to offer. Granted that the Government are right and that we are wrong in regard to this question of denominational schools, will the Bill which we have elaborated so carefully in the Committee stage probably work smoothly, as the Government say, or will it break down in working, as many of us on this side believe? I heard the Parliamentary Secretary the other day use a phrase with regard to the new provisions in relation to these schools. He spoke of "dual ownership." Well, that is to me an ominous phrase. I cannot remember any dual ownership that has been successful. It has been tried with regard to land in Ireland, and both landlords and tenants are heartily sick of the plan. Remember the Bill starts badly. Many Councils have declared their intention of refusing to carry out the Bill. I hope they will not do anything of the kind. Other Councils have objected to a majority of the voluntary school managers being of a denominational character. Some Nonconformists have threatened not to pay their rates. Remember that these local authorities you are appointing are, as County Councils and Town Councils, accustomed to have absolute control of those matters of local Government placed under their charge. They have not been accustomed to be tied by red tape—well, I will not use that phrase which may be regarded as objectionable—but they have not been accustomed to the control which will be exercised by the Education Department in connection with the matters with which they have to deal, nor have they been like Guardians of the Poor, subject to the superintendence of the Local Government Board. They have hitherto been accustomed, in dealing with their own affairs, to absolute control, but they will now find themselves in a new position, with any number of possible causes of friction arising between them and the managers of voluntary schools. I will only enumerate some of these cases. In regard to economy, the local authority in counties will have one representative on boards of management in favour of economy, against five whose interest it will be to get all they can. In most schools no trouble will arise with respect to teachers, but it will be inevitable in some. There are questions of alterations and improvements; damage to furniture out of school hours; the share of fees and endowments; the different views on new schools, and the delimitation of religious and secular education. In all these matters there will be appeals to the Board of Education, and consequent delay, irritation, and ill-feeling. In the end, I believe the local authorities will conquer, but in the meantime you run risk of denominational teaching perishing altogether in the conflicts that must arise. Time only can show, and at any rate we are free from responsibility.

The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, in his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill, made a powerful and eloquent appeal to Christians of all denominations, whether Churchmen, Roman Catholics, or Nonconformists, to unite in one supreme effort to stem the tide of materialism which was sweeping over the land. I cannot but sympathise with that appeal. I feel as strongly as the noble Lord does that there are many tendencies of the present age which are not only mundane and secular, but entirely forgetful of the higher and nobler ideals of existence. One sees it in the race for wealth, in the pursuit of pleasure as the main end of life, and in the recklessness and frivolity of some classes of society. Whence come these tendencies? Do they come from a proletariat fed on Cowper-Temple teaching, and would they have been restrained by denominational Christianity? No. They come from the higher classes, and they are only gradually permeating the lower. They arise from the fact that money today, mere money, can buy place and power and title, the favour of the great and the friendship of the powerful, to an extent that it never could before. They arise from the false conception that happiness in this world can only be obtained by an endless round of gaiety and excitement. This is a movement which, beginning in the higher classes, is permeating the middle classes, and going down to the lower classes. One conspicuous fruit is seen in the secularisation of the Sabbath, and in the fact not that our poor children do not repeat the Creed on week days, but that the upper classes have almost ceased on even one day out of seven to turn their thoughts to higher and holier things. When I am asked to believe that this tendency, which I deplore and for which the upper classes of society are responsible, is going to be stopped by teaching the children of the lower classes creeds and catechisms instead of the simpler hymns and prayers and Bible teaching of the Cowper-Temple Clause, I must veil the rudeness of my reply by cloaking it in an ancient language, and answer, *Credat Judæus Apella.* That is my frank opinion on the deeper aspects of this question. But though I prefer good Cowper-Temple teaching myself, I desire to preserve denominational teaching on lines which are fair to all. This Bill, while it mitigates one-man rule in our public elementary schools retains denominational management and favours denominational teachers by methods which are unfair and therefore cannot and must not last. I do not say there is no good in this Bill. On the contrary, there is much that is useful. But I do say that in these vital matters on which I have touched it violates the eternal principles of justice, and therefore, I for one must vote against the Third Reading.

(7.20) MR. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford): I am sorry that the hon. Gentleman opposite cannot see his way to support the Bill. The hon. Member said that he and other members of the Opposition did not wish to wreck the Bill or to make the working of it impossible. With respect to those who have expressed other views, I am sure we all hope that when the Bill comes into operation good counsels will prevail throughout the country. As one who has not always found himself able to agree with the Government as to some of the details of the Bill, I cordially support the Third Reading, because I am thoroughly in favour of the principle of the Bill. The Bill proposes to place the educational system in each district under the control of one authority. The county and borough councils which will in future have charge of our education are popularly elected bodies, and therefore the control of the people or the ratepayers over education will be theoretically complete. But it may be said that these bodies have not been elected for the particular purpose of education. Are we, I should like to ask, to have a separate local authority for every public function? It appears to me to be contrary to all our ideas of representative Government. It is not necessary to have one House of Commons for the consideration of financial questions, another for the consideration of Imperial questions, and another for the consideration of our home or social questions, but we have one body of Members sent here by the constituencies throughout the country to deal with all those questions, and in the same way our local authorities have many important functions to perform. I do not see on what may be called constitutional grounds why the question of education should not be entrusted to them. I think that in entrusting education to the local authorities there is one great advantage. The members of the new bodies will know the educational needs of the different districts. They will know what the local industries are and what the requirements of the children are in each separate locality. That is the main principle of the Bill on account of which I feel that I can give it my cordial support.

If I may say so, I think my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board dealt in a peculiarly happy way with the speech made this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. In dealing with this question the Prime Minister had to deal with the existing circumstances which he finds with regard to education. A large majority of the children throughout the country are being educated at the present moment in voluntary schools belonging to trustees, on behalf of some religious denomination or other, or else in schools which are the private property of landowners, or, in some cases, large employers of labour. The Act of 1870 allowed those voluntary schools to remain, and I venture to say that the Government have adopted a wise policy in allowing them to remain under this Bill. There is only one alternative, and I listened with great attention to the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition to hear what alternative policy he was going to put before the country. I noticed that his expressions with regard to this matter were of extremely mild and moderate terms. He spoke in a comparative sense. He said more popular control ought to be given over the voluntary schools, and that this Bill did not give sufficient control. Either you must adopt some such scheme as that contained in this Bill, or sweep away all the voluntary schools belonging to the different denominations throughout the country. There is no middle course to pursue, and I am anxious to hear whether the Leader of the Opposition and his friends in this House are prepared to adopt that policy. I should have very little anxiety or doubt as to what the answer of the electors throughout the country would be if these two alternatives were placed clearly before them. Under this Bill the control of the local authority over secular education will be absolute. The managers are to carry out the instructions of the local authority, and they will, as regards secular education, be their agents, and therefore, in my opinion, there is no possible objection to the aid to be given from the rates for the voluntary schools. I must say for myself that, as a Churchman, I should not have been afraid to give greater public representation on the boards of managers, and especially to give representation to the parents, but I do recognise that if the denominational character of the school is to be maintained it may be necessary that the number of foundation managers should be as proposed. I would point out that it will be open to the trustees to elect a representative of the parents to be a foundation trustee if they think fit. I regret, I need hardly say, that greater burdens are to be put upon the shoulders of the ratepayers, but I would remind those who are specially careful about the interests of the ratepayers that the Government have given a very generous grant for their relief. I hope the time is not far distant when education will be regarded still more as a national service paid for out of national funds. Of course, it was utterly impossible for the Government to deal with all those great and important questions at the same time, but I hope the time is not far distant when they will see their way to deal with the whole question of local taxation of which this will be an important part.

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned until this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [2nd December] to Question, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

(9.0) MR. ABEL SMITH: When, Sir, you left the Chair, I was referring—I confess with some trepidation—to what is known as the religious question in connection with this Bill. I think we have heard too much of this religious question, and I can only say, for myself, that if I thought the Nonconformists of this country had any real substantial grievances in this respect, I should be the first to be anxious to redress them. But, having given great consideration to their position, and knowing many of them, especially in my own constituency, I have come to the conclusion that these grievances are to a great extent theoretical, and I believe that it is only in very exceptional cases that they have any reason to complain of the religious instruction which has been given in the Church schools throughout the country. Under the provisions of this Bill what is known as the "one-man management" will be abolished, and where there is any considerable number of Nonconformists in a school district they will be in a position to elect a manager through the minor local authority, and will thus secure a share in the management of the elementary schools. I have the honour to represent in this House a county Division, partly urban and partly rural, in which there are many Nonconformists, and it is a rather remarkable fact that in the Division there are only two School Boards, which are in small rural parishes, while the other parishes, many of which have large and increasing populations, are served by voluntary schools. Although I have been connected with the Division all my life, I have never heard of any religious difficulty—I have never heard of any child being withdrawn from religious instruction in the Church schools, and therefore I think I am justified in saying that, at any rate as regards my own county, this religious difficulty is to a very great extent theoretical. We have heard a great many strong expressions of opinion on this subject; we have heard talk of "handing over the schools to the priests"; we have heard the Bill described as "a measure of relief to the clerical party"—whatever that may be; and we have also heard that it is designed for the destruction of Nonconformity. These expressions can only be described as gross exaggerations; they cannot be accepted as fair criticism, and I wish to join with my right hon. friend the Member for the Honiton Division of Devonshire in deprecating the use of such language. I hope the hon. Member for North Louth, who is, I believe, to speak presently, will either withdraw or justify—if he can—these expressions.

One cannot deal with this so-called religious question without referring to the sub-Clause which has made the name of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire famous for all time. I was a keen supporter of that Clause, because I regarded it as giving to the laity a fair share of the management of religious instruction in the schools. It has been very sharply criticised by members of the Established Church, and has been said to be inconsistent, but it has been upheld by men eminent in the Church. Canon Henson and Prebendary Smith are good enough Churchmen for me, and I believe, with them, that the Clause will do much to restrain the extravagant and fantastic teaching which has prevailed in a few exceptional cases. Under this Bill, Nonconformists will have more voice in the management of the schools than they ever had before, especially in rural districts, where in many cases the only school belongs to the Established Church. I believe that the extravagant fears indulged in cannot be justified, and I do appeal most earnestly to the leaders of Nonconformity to abandon their opposition to the Bill, and to work for the advancement of education under its provisions. Our system of national education needs reform and reconstruction in many respects, and I believe that this Bill would give that much-needed reform. If we all work together I feel confident that the measure will prove of great lasting benefit to the people of England and Wales.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): I am quite sure that the hon. Member who last spoke must have little knowledge of the history of Nonconformity of this country, and still less of the views of the governing bodies of the great Nonconformist Churches. It is inconceivable that the clergy and laity, who are responsible for the control of these vast organisations, can have been labouring under the hallucinations that the hon. Member imagines that they have been labouring under. My right hon. friend the Member for the Honiton Division of Devonshire, took me to task for some observations which I made in a little leaflet which I wrote some ago, and which has attained some little circulation. He complained because I said that the Church of England was honeycombed by a certain class of Romanizing literature. I was then dealing with the allegation made by the Ritualistic section of the Anglican Church in their journalistic organs, and also by their allies among the Roman Catholic clergy, that it was essential that the whole atmosphere of the schools should be Anglican and sacerdotal. These manuals of instruction to which I alluded were not isolated little catechisms, but they were manuals which had attained circulations of from 20,000 to 40,000 copies, and it is perfectly clear that this literature must have a great effect on the clergy, and, through them, on the schools for which they are responsible. I said that at least three-fourths of the clergy—those most active and most favoured by the Government, professed the doctrines and practised the ritual described in these manuals; and I should be only too glad to think that the section of the Anglican Church to which my right hon. friend belongs represents even one-fourth of the great religious community. But I am convinced that the most vigorous, the most energetic, and the most popular are these very clergy who are making such large use of these manuals. My right hon. friend, I thought, went a little bit astray when he cited his Egyptian analogy, for if he knew much about the condition of the great dependency of this country at the present moment he would be aware that one of the most serious dangers is the question of financial control which he thinks so attractive when applied to education. I do not know whether Mr. Forster ever imagined that his mantle would fall upon such an advocate of this system as the present Member for Central Bradford, but there is certainly a circumstance in connection with Mr. Forster's educational history which to some extent is repeating itself at the present moment. In Mr. Forster's "Life" there is a very singular letter which he wrote to Lord Ripon, who was bitterly taking Mr. Forster to task for his conduct on the Education Bill of 1870. Mr. Forster defended himself by saying that if they could not get the Bill through with the assent and support of the Nonconformists of the country, then the Leader of the Liberal Party was determined that it should go through with the assent of the clerical section of the House of Commons. It is singular that the very men who were fighting tooth and nail against the Education Bill of 1870, having imposed on the Nonconformists of the country by collusion between a section of the Liberal Party and a Church of England section of the House of Commons, are the very men who at the present time are enabling the Government to carry this Bill through, in defiance of the protests of the Nonconformists from one end of the country to the other. I have never used the phrase that this Bill will kill Nonconformity. I do not believe that it is the intention of the Government, in bringing forward this Bill, to kill Nonconformity, but I do believe it is the hope of a very important section of the Church of England that the measure will have the effect of materially increasing the number of the supporters of the Church throughout the country by getting hold of these little Dissenting children in the elementary schools. Indeed this has been avowed by Canon Pendleton, a well-known inspector of schools in Lancashire, who declared that the syllabus was always so arranged as to give distinctive denominational instruction to the children of Nonconformists. But to talk about killing Nonconformity is, I quite admit, to use a phrase which is absurd. It is manifestly impossible to kill Nonconformity. But I would remind the House of two very important declarations which have been made by two accomplished leaders of Nonconformity in this country. My right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton, directly this Bill was propounded, pronounced it in this House to be a declaration of war against Nonconformity. The right hon. Gentleman is not a fanatical Dissenter, and I think that in using that phrase he accurately described the Bill in its relation to Nonconformity. But Cardinal Vaughan used a far more ominous phrase. He spoke of the Bill as a triumph of the Government over the Nonconformist opposition.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Has the hon. gentleman read the Cardinal's letter disclaiming that interpretation?

MR. PERKS: I am using the Cardinal's own words.

MR. TULLY: It would only be fair to read the Cardinal's second letter.

MR. PERKS: I have not got it here. I merely quoted the statement in order to support my argument that this Bill is regarded by two very prominent men as a direct attack upon Nonconformity. But, in addition, the Church of England authorities evidently regard the Bill as a measure which is of the very greatest importance to their own Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking early last year, said there were signs that the Government would listen to anything that was said because in a very great degree their own political position depended on it, and it would be rather awkward for them to face the Church if only its members were united on the subject of education. My right hon. friend the Member for Oxford University has appealed to Churchmen not to throw away the opportunity, which might never recur, of allowing the Church of England to continue to be, wherever her strength was equal to it, the religious instructor of the people. Surely these quotations justify in saying that this Bill is regarded as being directed by the King's Government against Nonconformists, and as a direct attack upon the religious tenets and the ecclesiastical position of English Nonconformists. We are told that it contains within it numerous concessions made to the Nonconformists. But why were not those who are responsible for the educational organisation of the Nonconformist Churches consulted with reference to the Bill before it was introduced? Why were not the Free Church leaders and the Wesleyans consulted? There were indications that the Roman Catholics were consulted, but then the children attending Roman Catholic schools formed but a very small proportion of the community. But there is a vast number of Nonconformist children in the Anglican schools, and inasmuch as the Nonconformist leaders were not consulted, it is rather extraordinary to expect us to accept with gratitude the scheme of the Government when not the slightest attempt has been made to bring them into line. My own conviction is that an attempt of that sort in the early stages of the question would possibly have succeeded. I think that the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause in all the schools would probably have been accepted by the Nonconformist Churches if it had been accompanied by a scheme for placing the whole of the elementary schools under real effective popular control. But the Nonconformist leaders were not consulted, and none of their organisations were taken into counsel for a moment. The Free Churches of this country — I am not speaking of the Roman Catholic Church, but the Wesleyan Church, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and an organisation which for the last few years has exercised very great influence throughout the country (I mean the Federation of Free Churches) have laid down schemes of elementary education which distinctly define our position. We claim no authority; we ask for popular control. We claim that there should be no tests; and lastly, we ask for Christian Bible teaching to be given under the protection of the Conscience Clause by the teachers in the elementary schools.

The Prime Minister, speaking in Manchester, used language which was certainly very strong, and was not justified, with reference to the critics of the Bill. The Prime Minister said, "The voice of the calumniator has been too long uncontradicted," and the right hon. Gentleman proceeded to refer to two grave misrepresentations concerning the Bill. The first was the statement that School Board schools would be abolished; and the second was that "in the rate supported schools of the future, denominational teaching would be required by law." I venture to think that that is exactly what is going to happen; and that denominational teaching will be required by law. It is true that there will be the Conscience Clause, and that children can be withdrawn from the schools; but to tell us that it is a travesty of the Bill, that it is gross misrepresentation, and that it is falsehood of the blackest character to say that denominational teaching will be required by law under this Bill, is an assertion which cannot for a moment be justified. Because, what is that extraordinary Clause to which reference has been made by preceding speakers, and on which the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire is going to rest, for all eternity, his political fame. It is a direct instruction to managers that they are to give religious instruction in the schools in accordance with the tenour of the trust deeds. Surely, that is exactly what we have been declaring; and that is one of the grievances to which we justly take exception.

There are four grievances of which Nonconformists have to complain, and these, instead of being removed by this Bill, are exaggerated and enforced by it. In the first place, there is to be no application of the Conscience Clause to the training colleges. We endeavoured to secure for the pupil teachers who went up from the provinces to these great colleges, supported almost entirely out of public funds, the protection of the Conscience Clause, but we failed. The second grievance we have to complain of—I am not going to elaborate it, it is perfectly manifest to anyone who knows anything about the Bill—is that in 12,000 public schools in this country, supported almost entirely out of public funds, Nonconformists are excluded from the positions of headmaster and headmistress. A concession has been made in the case of pupil teachers; and permission which will never, or hardly ever, be exercised, has been given in the case of assistant teachers; but it is a serious blow to educational efficiency in this country to exclude from 12,000 schools Nonconformist teachers. The Prime Minister, a few weeks ago, rather plumed himself on the concession he had made to Nonconformists in connection with pupil teachers. It is just like teaching a boy how to eat his dinner, and then to bring him in and show him his dinner, and say, "Oh no, you are not to partake of it." You train these children for the teaching profession, and then you deliberately say to them, "In half the elementary schools of this country you shall not take first place, because of your religious opinions." That is a provision which, I think, will not hold good for many years. It is opposed to the whole tendency of public opinion, and even of legislation, during the past half century; and I wonder how long the Government really imagine such a condition of affairs is going to last. That is the second grievance which has been exaggerated, instead of being ameliorated, under the Bill. The third grievance we have is that the bishops and clergy of the Anglican Church will have to settle what is to be the religious teaching of 700,000 Nonconformist children in Anglican elementary schools. In Lincolnshire—I refer to it because I know it better than any other county—in many cases 70 per cent., in some cases 80 per cent., and generally 50 per cent. of the children attending the public elementary schools belong to the Methodist or some other section of Nonconformity. It seems to us a great injustice that the parents of these children should have absolutely nothing to do with their religious education; and that, in the event of any question arising as to religious instruction, the bishop of the diocese and the local clergy should be the people to deal with it. I am not able to say, I do not think the Government themselves can say, what is their interpretation of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. I should like to know what would happen in this case, which occurred at Plymouth or Portsmouth, and was brought before the House a few weeks ago. A sailor, on coming home from sea, found that his little girl had been caned several times in an elementary school because she would not bow down to some image in the church she was taken to.

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): I do not know whether the hon. Member is alluding to this story as a matter of fact, but it has been absolutely denied. The father has withdrawn his statement, and legal proceedings have been taken in the matter.

MR. PERKS: I have here a copy of the affidavit.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Which the father now acknowledges to be untrue.

MR. PERKS: I am glad to hear that. I pass from that to a case which occurred at Dorchester. There the clergyman has given some explanation. He says the children were ordered, not to bow to the altar, but towards the altar. Crucifixes were put up, the children were compelled to bow to them, and they were only removed on the protest of the local Nonconformists. What I wish to know from the Secretary to the Board of Education is, who will be responsible in such cases? Will it be the managers? The clergyman may say, "I will have a crucifix put up in this elementary school," and the managers might reply that they would not have it. Who would then decide? Take another case. Children in many parts of the country in elementary schools are taught a little series of phrases called "Hail! Mary," which is used in the Roman Catholic Church, and very largely also in the Anglican Church. Who will say whether that little prayer or invocation is to be used or not? Will it be the managers or the clergyman of the parish? What is the interpretation of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause? Is it solely limited to an appeal to the Bishop as to the religious instruction which may be given, or to the text books to be used; or does it extend to things put up in the school, such as crucifixes or to little invocations such as I have mentioned. For example, in many parts of the country children have been marched to Mass on Saints' Days. For instance, on St. Matthew's Day the children in a particular school were marshalled up on the highway and taken to Mass. Who would be responsible in such a matter? Would it be the managers or the clergyman? I hope, and indeed I believe, that the construction which will be put on the Kenyon-Slaney Clause by the Courts of Law when it gets there—which I have no doubt will be very soon, if it passes in its present shape, as already there is conflict between the Church papers and the Government, and the Bishop of London disagrees entirely with the interpretation given by the Attorney General—I hope, and indeed believe, that the interpretation which will be put on the Clause will be that the local managers will have absolute control as to the use of manuals of devotion, the putting up of little ecclesiastical symbols in the schools, and the arrangements for marching the children to church on the various festivals connected with the Church.

There is one other grievance which Nonconformists seriously complain about, and that is that the Bill perpetuates, to some extent, one of the grievances and inequalities of the Act of 1870—namely, facilities for the erection of new sectarian schools and the enlargement of sectarian schools; which are denied to the local public education authority, because a number of conditions are imposed which the Education Department in London will take into consideration on the appeal of ten agreed parishioners. The extra cost involved will be a grievous injustice to all who wish to see the extension of schools under public control, not the extension of sectarian schools, whether Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, or Anglican. I wish just to refer to a misconception which is very current, and which has frequently been referred to in this House. The Nonconformists have been charged with wishing to teach what is called "Nonconformist religion," and School Board schools certainly, and some of our Nonconformist schools, have been called Godless schools. The Colonial Secretary, speaking at Birmingham, said that Wesleyans in their schools taught "Wesleyanism," whatever that may be. There is no such thing as the teaching of Wesleyanism in Wesleyan schools. I know nothing in the doctrines of the Wesleyan Church which differs from the doctrines of the Evangelical section of the Anglican Church, except the application of the cardinal principles of Christian faith. I observe that Cardinal Vaughan the other day said—

> "Do not suppose that Christianity is a science that needs no training to teach it aright, but that any infidel, or any fool, if he likes, can teach the Christian religion to children."

I quite understand the Catholic principle, as now asserted, that the clergy have the prescriptive right alone to teach religion; but that is a doctrine which Nonconformists absolutely repudiate. The prescriptive right of experts alone to criticise and teach is now going beyond the province of religion and is invading even the province of literature. But the Methodist Church, which ranks in number next to the Church of England, and in the United States stands first as regards number, depends for its doctrinal teaching on lay teaching, on lay interpretation of the Scriptures, and lay deduction of the principles of Christian faith from the Scriptures. Next Sunday, 25,000 sermons will be preached in Methodist churches, mission halls, and class rooms, throughout the country, and, of these, 20,000 will be preached by laymen of all ranks of society. We entirely repudiate the notion that you can only have a clerical expert to expound the Scriptures, and enforce their teaching on children in elementary schools. Our object is not secularism. We are as much opposed to secularism as hon. Members below the Gangway can be. In fact, we hold in common with them certain principles of Christian faith; it is only when we come to their practical application that we differ from them; but we are opposed to secularism just as much as we are opposed to clericalism in the elementary schools. The Wesleyan authorities have represented again and again that what they wished for was Bible instruction given by a teacher in whom they had absolute confidence, as regards his intelligence and fairness towards all sections of the children.

I wish to say a few words about the attitude of the Nonconformist Churches towards the Roman Catholic Church in this country. We voted on the side of Catholic emancipation at a time when the Anglican Church in this country opposed it. We are willing that Roman Catholics should have absolute equality in every possible detail, but we are willing to concede to them nothing more whatever. The Nonconformist Churches in this country will, in my judgment, never agree to any special privileges or concessions being given to the Roman Catholic Church. We want to have absolute equality. We are willing to concede that to the Roman Catholics, and will fight along with them to get it; but we cannot give them any special privileges or rights which we are unwilling to give to other religious communities. We have been asked by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean and by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Oldham to work this measure, and discourage, in every possible way, the contention put forward that it is the duty of Nonconformists to resist the payment of the rate. The question whether a Nonconformist will be justified or not in resisting the rate is a matter for each individual conscience, and, having settled that problem for himself, he will not be likely to be influenced in the slightest degree by the fact that he may lose his right as a citizen. I would remind the House that if the great Nonconformist communities take this serious step, they will, to some extent, be following the advice given by the Colonial Secretary in Birmingham in 1872, when he said—

> "It had been said that he encouraged resistance to a law—at all events he did not encourage active resistance to the law. They were not going to fight the bailiffs, they were going to submit in their way; but an alternative was provided for them—an alternative which landed them in great sacrifices, but still permitted them to make a protest. Whatever might have been the opposition brought against the old Church rate, let the majority not doubt for a moment that there would be just as stout an opposition against the new; and the result which followed the opposition of the opponents of the former, would in good time follow the opposition of the opponents of the latter."

There is no doubt that the decision to which Nonconformists will have to come will be a very grave one; but I do not see any conflict between the advice that has been given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, and the advice that will have to be given by the leaders of Nonconformity. It will be quite possible in the constitution of the County Councils and of the local bodies of management to use every exertion in public elections, in the Press, and on the platform, to secure an adequate representation, and possibly in many parts of the country an effective control, over these educational agencies; and if this Bill is likely to have, as I fear it will, a paralysing effect on education through placing the children of the country largely under clerical control, I think it will be the paramount duty of all these organised institutions of Nonconformity to put forth their utmost efforts to secure, in a way they have never yet done in the present generation, a control of or adequate representation on these educational bodies. But I ought to say that that is quite a distinct and separate question from the other, which is still more grave, namely: whether it will be the duty of the Nonconformist churches to recommend their followers to organise a resistance, passive or active, against the payment of the rate which may be charged for the maintenance of these local sectarian schools. Already, there are manifest indications that the country is dividing itself into two great hostile camps. On the one side we have the Anglican Church working on the lines of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Roman Catholic clergy and laity. On the other side we have the representatives of labour. It is indeed a noteable fact that not one single labour organisation, no trades union, has pronounced in favour of the Bill. Everyone of them has reprobated it; and, surely, it cannot be said that those who ought to know the true interests of the children are the clergy, the upper classes and the privileged sections of Society, and that they alone have a prescriptive and paramount right to tell the working classes how their children ought to be taught.

Have the working classes no knowledge in this matter? On the other side, therefore, we have the labour organisations of the country, we have the whole of the Protestant community, and we have the Nonconformists solid. We may find here and there a Nonconformist who is put up on a public platform by a bishop of the Anglican Church as a sort of exhibit of Nonconformist opinion. I remember a friend of mine who took a great interest in foreign missions but had never seen a convert. One day he went down to the docks and got a little black boy from the captain of one of the steamers, put him on a platform and exhibited him as a triumph of missionary enterprise. The other day an Anglican Bishop put one of our Methodist Tory baronets on the platform of the Albert Hall as a specimen. The thing was ludicrous, because the overwhelming majority of the Tory section of the Methodist Church, the Wesleyan Church, had pronounced against the Bill. At last we have a united Party against the Bill. There is no schism; we have not had to form any league; there is absolute unity in our Party. I do not believe that we can be charged with being guilty of travesty and misrepresentation when we talk of the clerical control and clerical influence which will be exercised under this Bill. We believe it to be a serious danger. John Bright speaking in this House on the education question said: "Nothing tends more to impede the progress of liberty, nothing is more fatal to independence of spirit in the public, than to add to the powers of the priesthood in the matter of education." It is because we are anxious to defend liberty of thought, which, in our judgment, is at the root of commercial and political progress, that we are opposed to a measure which has been inspired by the clergy, and which has the stamp of ecclesiasticism over almost every section of it.

SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester): Concurrently with a general support of this Bill, the only criticism I wish to offer is that provision for the teacher of voluntary schools has not been made as it has been made for the teacherss of board schools. A great number of these teachers will now be transferred to the local authorities, and I can only say that, if their office is abolished or altered in any way, or if their pay is lessened, or if they suffer any loss, proper and reasonable compensation ought to be provided for them in this Bill; and those teachers who have experienced the difficulties existing under the voluntary system should not now be subjected to any measure of injustice. I hope there may yet be time to make some provision for them in this respect. Apart from that, I have nothing but praise for the Bill, and I most heartily support its third reading. Judging from the resolutions and petitions from my own constituency in favour of this measure, I must say that I feel that I have a mandate to give this Bill my hearty support, and I should be false to those who entrusted me with their confidence if I did not support this Bill. My own view is that this Bill is a democratic measure, designed in the best interests of the children of this country, and I believe that it is another great measure of constructive reform for which right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench are so justly famed. This Bill will offer great advantages to the present generation, and will also have a great influence on the future prosperity and progress of this country.

(10.5.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The hon. Member who has just sat down can scarcely expect me to imitate the general terms of praise which he has bestowed upon this Bill. This measure is now passing from us. It is past our mending, and it is going to a place where it is not likely to be amended. Looking at the fact that in all its provisions this Bill is closely connected with the granting of money, I can hardly hope that in another place it will be compatible with constitutional usage to alter this Bill at all. This Bill, Sir, has been passed under unprecedented circumstances. Although it is not a Bill of an urgent character, although there is no obstruction, although all the discussion upon it has been honest and practical, directed to an examination of its provisions and to a fair and reasonable criticism of them, many of its most important Clauses have been passed without any debate whatever. The proof of the value of the debates we have had on the Bill is to be found in the fact that whenever a Clause was properly debated it immediately grew in dimensions. If hon. Members will refer to Clause 7, which was originally Clause 8, and compare it with Clause 8 as it stood originally, they will find that this Clause has more than doubled in size, and I think not more than one-fourth of the original Clause remains. That was because we were allowed to debate that Clause pretty thoroughly. Similarly, Clause 12 has been very largely changed and greatly improved, and if more time had been allowed no doubt we should have been able to effect similar improvements in other parts of this Bill. The schedules were never discussed at all either in the Committee stage or upon report, and yet they contained a great many important provisions, some of them introduced in fulfilment of undertakings made on other Clauses of the Bill.

The Bill itself has been very nearly doubled in size. It began as a measure of fourteen pages, including the schedules, and it is now a Bill of twenty-four pages. A great deal of time, no doubt, has been spent upon it, but the fact that so much time was spent upon it was due to the condition in which it came before the House. It was in some respects the worst drafted Bill that we have had for many years past in this House, not that I mean to reflect upon the drafting of the Parliamentary draughtsmen, who have done their work thoroughly, but I refer more particularly to the part of the drafting which belongs to the instructions given to the draughtsmen as to the nature of the problems which they were to introduce into the Bill. Anyone who read the Bill could perceive from the first that in many points it was vague and obscure, and sometimes I think it was intentionally obscure, for many material matters were omitted, sometimes from mere negligence, and occasionally omitted because it was desired to evade the difficult questions which would have been raised. It was necessary that the discussion should be very thorough, and as everyone knows who has followed these debates, we are able to discover in almost every Clause a great number of points which it became necessary to alter by Amendments.

Even now we have left many points doubtful. Take the last subject which employed us—I mean the case of the Amendment made at the instance of the hon. and gallant Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire. When we discussed that Amendment a few days ago, two diametrically opposite views of its effect were put forward, one by the Attorney General and the other by some other lawyers of eminence in this House. It is now left for the courts of law to determine which of these views is correct. Of course we know that it sometimes happens, owing to the haste with which our work is done, or owing to the fact that we do not perceive all that may arise, we do make work for the courts of law, but is it creditable to us or is it creditable to any assembly of our status and experience that we should deliberately leave questions which will be immediately litigated upon, and which will send the unhappy parties to the courts in order to determine what we ought to have determined here? I must say that in reviewing this Bill, which has cost us so much time and labour, we are now almost too exhausted to be able to discuss it properly, and I notice that to-day an atmosphere of exhaustion, limpness, and lassitude has pervaded the House.

Reviewing these debates, although some of the most salient faults have been removed, and the Bill is rather more workable than it was at first, I must say that, so far as the objections taken on this side of the House are concerned, they have not been to any appreciable extent removed. In my view, and if I may venture to express what I think is the general view of this side of the House, the Bill is no better, and in some respects it is distinctly worse, than when it was brought into the House. Therefore, we have nothing to thank the Government for, and do not let it be regarded that any concessions which have been made are considered to be of the slightest value. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] I am sorry to say that if we look at these questions of principle, upon which our objections were directed, I do not think this Bill goes any way to remove them. In one point in particular I regret very much that the option was not given to the great boroughs of retaining their School Boards if they thought fit, a point upon which so much stress was laid by the two hon. Members for Newcastle. I regret exceedingly that that provision has been struck out, because it would have facilitated the transition from the old to the new system, and would have given these great bodies the opportunity of obtaining the services which we know they value very highly.

Let us ask for the sake of comparison what we have done now by this Bill, and what was intended at first. Let us ask what it was that this Bill promised to do and what has it in fact performed. We were told when the Bill was introduced that it was to secure the denominational schools, that it was to co-ordinate all forms of education, that it was to unify and simplify the authorities, that it was to promote secondary education, that it was to establish a harmonious and uniform national system, and, finally, that it was to put an end to religious controversy and to effect a final settlement. All these objects, except the first, on which there is a vital difference of opinion between the two sides of the House, are laudable and excellent, and if the Bill had been really designed to attain these objects it would have had nothing but support from this side of the House. Let us see how far they have been attained. The Bill has placed the voluntary schools on the rates, but it has departed from the understanding which was announced when it was brought in. We were then told that the maintenance of these schools was to be put on the rates, upon the condition that the managers were to undertake the cost of the repairs. That condition has been entirely departed from in three material points, not one of which was in the Bill, and everyone of which was introduced late in the Committee stage since we met in October. What has the result of these three changes been? There is the rent of the school houses, and the rent of the houses of the teachers has been estimated at £50,000 a year, a sum which will go to the voluntary schools in the future. That is, at any rate, the best estimate I have been able to find. The sum which will be obtained by the voluntary school managers from endowments under the Clause which gave them a share of the endowments has been estimated at

£75,000 a year, and the sum which they may receive from fees has been estimated at £90,000 a year, making up altogether a sum of £215,000 a year as the estimated amount which will come to voluntary schools under this Bill.

Now let us see what is the amount of the repairs, or rather the probable total cost of repairs which are to be undertaken by the managers of voluntary schools. The Bishop of London, I am informed, estimates the probable total cost of the repairs for the Church of England schools at £150,000 a year. If we take three-fourths of the £215,000 as the share of the Church of England schools, we arrive at the sum of £162,000 a year, so that in return for a charge of £150,000 for repairs, the Church of England voluntary school managers stand to receive £160,000 a year out of the subventions given to them by the Bill. That is to say they make a clear profit out of the transaction. I shall be told that this will not happen in every area. I have no doubt that is so, but what is intended is to have an arrangement by which all that is received over the areas is to be "pooled," and then an area which has not got these sources of income of their own is to be helped out of the general fund. What will the result of that be? The liability which, we were originally told, was to be undertaken by the managers of Church of England schools will disappear altogether. They will have a sum of money which will probably be large enough for distribution over the areas to relieve them from the necessity of obtaining any subscriptions at all in order to pay for the repair of these schools. I think we may fairly say that whether there is that bargain or not, there has been a complete departure from the understanding originally arrived at, and from the terms upon which this Bill was originally presented to the House.

What does this amount to? Some hon. Members earlier in the debate said that this amounted to a re-endowment of the Church of England. At anyrate I think it is a re-endowment for the purposes of education in the Church of England. It amounts to giving funds to the Church of England which, without this Bill she would not have had, and which nobody expected her to have. And in a certain sense it may almost be said that the Bill goes to establish the Church of England in a further sense than that in which it was established before, because we have under its provisions made one curious change. If the Attorney General is right in his interpretation of the so-called Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, it has the effect of making the bishop the arbiter to determine what is to be the religious instruction to be given in State schools. For these schools are no longer voluntary schools. They are now to be entirely supported by the State, and the giving of such a right to the bishop was never contemplated when we began this Bill, and it is a provision which not only surprises us, but seems rather more appropriate to the sixteenth than to the twentieth century. What else does the Bill do? It destroys the bodies which have done most for education—the School Boards in the great towns. It confirms the exclusion of half the nation from headmasterships and head teacherships of schools, and it gives them a doubtful right of entry into other teaching. It heaps on Borough and County Councils a vast mass of new work, for which they have no previous experience whatever. This work is admitted to be so heavy that we are invited to devolve some of it upon another authority. The committee has no power of deciding any question; they are not answerable to the people, and, therefore, responsibility is lost because it is divided between two authorities, and because the electors have no opportunity of reviewing the conduct of those who have been chosen. It will not be in the power of the Council, with all their public spirit and zeal, to change the line of administration and to lay down a policy.

In the same way, it will be impossible for the electors to have an opportunity of determining the lines of policy, because those in whose hands the conduct of the business lies never come before them at an election, and because when the county and borough councillors do come before them there will be such a diversity of questions to be determined that it will be impossible to concentrate attention on educational questions alone. This, to my mind, is one of the grave objections to the whole scheme, and it is one upon which sufficient stress has not been laid. But if the Government desire to have an educational policy which shall be the mirror of the mind of the nation, in the same sense that Parliament ought to be the mirror of the opinion of the nation, they cannot get it by such a system as they have established in the Bill. In each parish they are going to perpetuate two different kinds of schools under different kinds of managers—schools which can not be worked together as being parts of one system. I regret to see that the President of the Local Government Board and the hon. and learned Member for Stretford are not in their places. I have noticed that there is a tendency, after delivering Third Reading speeches, for hon. Gentlemen to disappear. They remind me of the Sultan in Omar Khayyam, "who bides his destined hour and goes away." The President of the Local Government Board argued that the system would be uniform because all the schools would be under the control of the local authority. Within a limited area it is capable of being served by different schools. One set may be under managers entirely at the disposal of the local authority; the other set will not be. In one set the committee will have power over the buildings at all times; in the other set they will only have power during the day, and during the evening they will have to make arrangements with the managers while they are only entitled to the use of the buildings three nights a week. In one set of schools they will appoint and dismiss the teachers; in the other set they will not have the power. In one set of schools they will be able to unite, divide, enlarge or reduce schools; they will be able to group different schools under the same set of managers; but in the other set they can do none of these things. [AN HON. MEMBER: They can group them.] But they cannot group them with schools which are provided schools.

The Government have put obstacles and difficulties at every step in the way of harmonious and efficient administration. Entrenched under this Bill and behind these trust deeds the non-provided schools will be able to defy the local authority in what may be proved to be the most necessary and urgent reform. They can require it to keep up three small weak schools in an area where one strong school would be infinitely better to serve the needs of the people. Confusion and waste will continue under this system, and small schools may be multiplied. Economy will be sacrificed, because the voluntary managers have no motive for economy. Efficiency will be sacrificed as well, because the local authority will be distant and will not have an intimate and direct knowledge of the schools necessary to give it a proper and effective control. For secondary education the Bill seems to him to do practically nothing. It does provide some money, but not the whole of the money for this purpose under the Act of 1890. It imposes no obligation; it does not require a local authority to do any more for secondary education than it pleases. It gives them no directions what to do. When we were discussing Clauses 2, 3 and 4 it was pointed out that there were many matters on which it was urgently necessary that some directions should be given, and many of the matters connected with secondary education were left entirely untouched by the Bill. Excellent proposals were put down by my right hon. friend the Member for East Somerset, who placed on the Paper a number of Clauses containing very useful practical provisions, some of them drawn from his own knowledge and some of them from representations made by the Royal Commission, expressing the wishes of County Councils and technical committees, which would have turned this Bill into a very fair measure for secondary education. The new Clauses which have been submitted have been closured, but the Government had an opportunity on the Report stage to adopt them and to incorporate them in the Bill. That they have not done so affords conclusive proof of the indifference which they have shown to the educational side of the measure. If the admirable suggestions made by the right hon. Member for East Somerset had been taken up by the Government it would have caused them no trouble, and they would have greatly added to the value and utility of the Bill. The rural problem, one of the most pressing in connection with the whole question of education, is left untouched. We had an opportunity of dealing with it on the Clause relating to endowments.

We were dealing with a sum of between £100,000 and £200,000 a year, which would have been of the utmost value in endeavouring to give to poor children in neglected rural districts an opportunity of getting something better than the mere elementary education which the small board schools have hitherto been able to give. You cannot have secondary schools in all these districts, but you might have here and there a secondary class at the top of the school, as they have in Scotland, or you might establish scholarships or exhibitions of small amount to carry promising and industrious scholars to the nearest secondary school. These endowment funds would have been of the utmost value for such purposes, but the money has been practically thrown away, and given in part to the managers and part to the rates. Even the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset, to enable the local authority to apply for schemes for the utilisation of these endowments, was not taken up and carried through by the Government.

For the unification of authorities, which has been represented as one of the main objects of the Bill, hardly anything has been done. Something is given with one hand, but nearly as much is withdrawn with the other. It is perfectly true, as the President of the Local Government Board said, that the Government would have encountered some resistance in carrying their proposal; but unless they did intend carrying it they had no right to represent this scheme as unifying the authorities. Instead of doing that, the scheme passes by the most vital part of what real unification ought to effect. All boroughs and urban districts have received an independent rating power for secondary education, so that you have reintroduced overlapping on the largest scale, and lost the opportunity of consolidating funds for the purposes of secondary education. What becomes of "one authority" and "co-ordination" under such a scheme as that?

The Bill, except as regards the voluntary schools, fulfils no one of the promises with which it was introduced. It fails as regards secondary education; it fails as regards unity and co-ordination. In spite of the specious phrases scattered here and there throughout the Bill, it fails to prevent overlapping, and it fails to secure economy or efficiency. The Prime Minister has said that in these debates there has been much talk about religion and some about local government, but very little about education. That is true. But why has there been very little about education? Because there is very little about education in the Bill. The Bill is almost entirely concerned either with questions which arouse religious passion, or with questions of local government.

We have been taunted with having no alternative scheme. I may tell the right hon. Gentleman that twice I desired to bring forward such a scheme, and twice the Closure on Clauses prevented me doing so. I will not attempt to develop that scheme now, but one part of it would have been to increase local areas of education—I do not think the county is the proper area for elementary education; it is far too large; but we could have found an area larger than the parish, which would have been a very effective educational area. The Bill has displeased many of the local authorities. Some of the County Councils resent it because it introduces an element of strife and controversy from which they have been hitherto free, and imposes upon them duties which they have not the time or experience properly to discharge. Others have even gone so far as to declare their intention to refuse to work the Bill. The County Councils, as a whole, I believe, through their Association, have expressed their strong disapproval of many of the provisions of the Bill which restrict their powers, and subject them to the Board of Education.

These objections taken by the county authorities, do not promise well for the working of the Bill. The irritation amongst the local authorities is the least part of the harm which has been done. The Bill has created intense exasperation among large and active sections of the community. This has been manifested not only among Nonconformists, but also the working classes. One hon. Member has said that the Bill confers benefits on the working classes. If so, the latter do not know their friends, because the working classes, including the trades unionists and co-operators, have without exception condemned the Bill, believing that it sacrifices their interests to the demands of a section of the clergy. How can a Bill opposed by such large and important sections of the people, be represented as being a message of peace, or calculated to remove controversy from the field of education and effect a final settlement? It does the exact opposite. The fire that was burning low has leapt up with tongues of flame, and, I fear, will continue to burn. The Bill will introduce theological and political elements into elections hitherto free from them.

And for what gain has all this opposition been incurred? We are told that it was necessary to safeguard the denominational schools. That necessity has been enforced upon two grounds. The first, the bricks-and-mortar ground, is the most unreal pretext ever brought forward to obscure the true issues of a measure. Everybody knows that if it were a question of taking these schools at a fair and moderate rent the country would be willing to undertake the expense. So far from acquiescing in that extravagant doctrine with regard to the interference with trusts, I would remind the Secretary to the Board of Education that trusts have often been broken by legislation when Parliament thought it necessary to do so. The real, the substantial, reason in the minds of many, those whom I most respect, is the desire to preserve, in what they conceive to be the only way, the religious education of the people of this country. But what grounds have they for believing that this is the only way in which to safeguard the religious and moral character of the future generations of this country? If I could believe that only in this way that object was to be attained I might feel that there was a substantial compensation for the mischief to be expected from other parts of the Bill. What evidence is there that Church of England parents desire sectarian instruction for their children? No such evidence has been produced. The testimony is all the other way. English parents, we were told by the Secretary to the Board of Education, are not theologically minded.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: I was speaking of the managers, not of the parents.

Mr. BRYCE: I presume managers may be parents; at least I hope so.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: It is quite possible for a manager not to desire to interfere with the theological treatment of subjects by the clergyman, and yet for the same man, as a parent, to be extremely anxious for his children to learn their catechism.

Mr. BRYCE: But the hon. Gentleman was contrasting the interest of Scottish parents in theological matters with the total lack of such interest in English parents. The best proof that they are not anxious for this teaching is to be found in the fact that parents of the Church of England send their children to board schools just as freely as to denominational schools, even when denominational schools are equally within their reach. Nor is there any evidence that the children of the denominational schools are better citizens or better Christians than the children of board schools. If you can show that the voluntary schools turn out better members of the community, or more religious children, we should admit that you have made out your case. But no such evidence has been adduced, and we say that no such evidence can be found. Can any one say that during the thirty years in which the board schools and the voluntary schools have existed side by side there has been the slightest difference in the minds, the habits, or the character of the children they have turned out? Lastly, what evidence is there that children of twelve or thirteen can or do understand the distinctive teaching it is desired to give? How can they appreciate the dogmatic differences which are said to be so vital to their future life? Who of us at the age of twelve or thirteen appreciated these differences, and who would have retained them three years after leaving school? Is it true that in countries where the priesthood have the greatest influence on education the people have the greatest attachment to religion or most retain the habit of attending the public worship of God? Let us compare Protestant Germany on the one hand with Protestant America and the Protestant British Colonies on the other. In Germany the schools are largely denominational; in America and the British Colonies the schools are undenominational; and yet everybody knows that in Germany the number of churchgoers are only a small percentage of the number of churchgoers in America and the British Colonies. Denominational teaching has nothing to do with disposing the children to attend church during their subsequent years. I agree as to the moral atmosphere which may be created in a school by a teacher imbued with the principles of Christian morality and able to enforce them by his teaching. But that atmosphere depends on the teaching, not on the formularies. According to all the evidence, the moral atmosphere is just as strong and just as wholesome in its effects in the board schools as in the voluntary schools. Indeed, many dignitaries of the Church of England have given the most candid and frank testimony of the value of the undenominational religious teaching given in the board schools. I believe that the advocates of the Bill who think it will secure religious education, and through that the future welfare of the children of this country, are pursuing a mere phantom; they are sacrificing for a shadow the substance of a united, harmonious, undenominational system of education which would keep the children together and give them a common Christian teaching during their early years.

The House is losing by this Bill the greatest opportunity it has had for thirty years of conferring a benefit upon the education of the country. We are losing the opportunity of creating an efficient system of secondary education, which might have been created without any controversy had a Bill for that purpose and that purpose only been introduced. We have lost the opportunity of securing unity of management and the harmonious working of elementary schools in suitable areas, and of associating the people of each locality with the work of education. The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division spoke about the control of the local authority, forgetting that the kind of popular control that we want is popular control on the spot. The vital thing is to interest the people on the spot in their schools, but by this Bill local interest is actually diminished, because School Boards are abolished. Next to, or perhaps even greater than, the harm done to education by the introduction of religious controversy has been the harm done by the want of popular interest in it. It is the want of a real living interest in the people of this country in education that is its great drawback. That want of interest is not confined to the humbler classes, and it is largely owing to the fact that we have never had a genuinely popular system. Surely we ought, above all things, to endeavour to make our system popular. That is the secret of the success of the American, Swiss, Scottish, and Colonial systems; it is because the people in the different localities in those countries are the managers of their own schools that they will make sacrifices for education. You want to give the parent a voice in the management of the school in which his own children will be taught, so that he will do, as a ratepayer and elector, that which will be for the benefit of his child as a pupil. A system which is popular is more effective in a country like England than a system on which more money is spent but which is not popular, and managed from a centre.

These are critical years for England. We cannot afford to stand still while the rest of the world is moving. We are now losing an opportunity, and it may be many years before we can retrieve it. Certainly the plan the Government have proposed cannot be regarded as a final plan. It is an ill-compacted scheme, and a cumbrous compromise between opposite methods. It is founded on no principle that endures; it is based on the sands, and it must crumble and fall. The passing of this Bill is not the end, but the beginning, of the struggle. You have made the old controversy more acute than it was before; you have emphasised the latent opposition between the claims of the clergy and the feelings of the laity in the Church of England, as well as the differences between the two leading schools of opinion in the Church—a difference which goes deeper than that between the Evangelical school and Nonconformists—and you have brought into the foreground the question of a State Church itself. You have made people ask whether the extraordinary demands which have been put forward, I will not say by, but for and on behalf of, the

Church of England, do not spring from the fact that one Church is blessed in this country with privileges and a *status* which are entirely unsuited to our time and popular Constitution, and which are incompatible with the principles of religious freedom and equal citizenship. It is not the Opposition who have raised this controversy. It has been forced upon us, and we are obliged to accept the challenge. We deny the moral authority of a Bill which has taken the country by surprise, which was framed without any attempt to meet and respect the conscientious feelings of large sections of the people, and which has been carried by violent methods, under which parts have never been discussed at all. What will happen in the next few years I will not venture to say, but when we look at other democratic communities and see how the problem of education has been solved in Switzerland, in Holland, in the United States, and in the Colonies, we cannot doubt as to the ultimate issue. Those who think not of this or next year only, but who look beyond England, will indeed regret the loss of precious time, but at the same time they will not despair, because they will see beyond the clouds of confusion and bitterness, in whose shadow the struggle which is now beginning will have to be conducted, a clearer and a calmer sky, under which there will arise a system of education fitly organised, worthy of England, and commensurate with the needs of her people.

*(11.0.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON : The criticisms of the hon. Member for Oldham are more satisfactory to my mind than those of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. Member for Oldham might have voted for the Bill if its provisions for elementary and for secondary education had been different—if, in fact, it had been almost a different Bill. But from the point of view of the right hon. Gentleman this Bill has been bad in its conception, bad in its drafting, and bad in its conduct, and its provisions with regard to religion, to education, and local government are all bad. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the debates in this House have made the Bill worse than it was before.

MR. BRYCE : That is not what I said. I thought I conveyed quite distinctly that the changes that have been made had made the Bill a more workable Measure. What I stated was that the Government had not removed the objection we maintain to the principle.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON : Finally, the right hon. Gentleman said that arising from the Bill a fire was lit up in the constituencies, which I must confess, however, has found very inadequate representation in this House. Other hon. Members have complained that this Bill has undergone considerable change in the course of its progress through the House. But let us consider the magnitude of the subject undertaken. We have had really to recast the educational system of the country, both elementary and secondary. And it is not as if we had had a clean slate to write upon; we had to work through a mass of previous legislation and of existing custom in order to establish what we conceive to be a system resting on proper lines. The right hon. Gentleman talked of the present system as united, harmonious, and efficient.

MR. BRYCE : I said nothing of the kind. We have always admitted that it requires to be amended.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I have quoted the right hon. Gentleman's words.

MR. BRYCE: I did not apply them to the existing system.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I will consider the present system without reference to what I believe were the words of the right hon. Gentleman. Under the present system, there is, first, as regards secondary education, the power given to local authorities to deal with technical instruction under the Technical Instruction Acts, and the use of the whisky money; then there is the Science and Art Department at South Kensington, assisting scientific teaching of a different character; establishing secondary schools of science, making grants to other schools, as formerly to the School Boards. The

School Boards in the large towns made gallant efforts to fill the gap in our educational system, and to push their way from the elementary education, which is their proper task, into the region of secondary education, until they were checked by the Cockerton judgment. We are told that the Cockerton judgment shows how much simpler and better it would have been to deal with secondary education apart from elementary education. No doubt the Cockerton judgment by, to some extent, defining secondary, as distinct from elementary education, did make it easier to bring in a secondary education Bill, but, at the same time, it is quite plain, from the mode in which, under the efforts of the School Boards, elementary education has passed by insensible stages into secondary education, how important it is to have one authority to deal with the two. We have these various bodies, the technical instruction committees of the municipal bodies, the School Boards, the science and art grants to the different societies which enjoy them, and then behind them, in the region of elementary education, we have the small School Boards, with their insufficient areas, and the voluntary schools struggling against competition with rate-aided schools and with the requirements of the Board of Education. Besides which we have private enterprise and the old foundations in the region of the smaller secondary education schools, and the training of teachers wholly left to the enterprise of denominations assisted by Government grants, and not assisted by local effort at all. Out of this chaos this Bill endeavours to establish something like order, and surely, starting with this jumble of material on which to work, some changes in the course of the progress of the Bill through the House, as well as some drafting errors and omissions, might very well have been regarded as practically inevitable in the progress of the Bill.

Now as to the order which we are trying to establish. First, as regards the authority. What we have laid down with regard to the authority is, first, that the county or the county borough in each case is the one authority for all the education within the range of the County Council or County Borough Council. Then the boroughs and urban districts of 10,000 and 20,000 respectively are the authorities over elementary education within their area, and every borough and every urban district is an authority for secondary education to the extent of a penny rate. The comment of the Leader of the Opposition is that we have a great variety of authorities, and having dealt with the local authorities and their education committees, and of the managers of elementary schools, he spoke of the voluntary schools as having in the background the revolving bishop, whose orbit distracted the movement of these lesser luminaries, the managers of the voluntary schools. The different authorities, however, work into one another in very reasonable and logical order, so that we obtain a combination of local autonomy and educational uniformity. The County Council has the power of raising money to the extent of a 2d. rate, and the boroughs can levy their rate. Surely these boroughs, being authorities for elementary education not only relieve the local authority of the great burden of superintending all the elementary schools, but having their own elementary schools under their own eyes can see whether the need is for the higher elementary or the lower secondary education, and they can come forward and invite the County Council with its larger resources to help them, and thus you get a combination of local autonomy and uniformity of government in respect of that higher elementary and lower secondary education which is the most important branch of our educational system.

As regards education itself, we want good elementary schools so far as they go—good intermediate and technical schools, and good secondary schools — we do not want schools always attempting to do something different to what they are intended to do. Evening schools, except in a limited number of cases, and schools deriving grants from South Kensington, will be outside the range of elementary education, elementary schools being defined as schools for boys and girls up to the end of the year in which they reach the age of fifteen. Objection to this was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, who said it was an unfortunate thing that a boy who reached the top of the elementary school, and was capable of receiving further education, and had time for it, should not be enabled to continue his education at the same school, but should have to remove to another school, possibly at some distance off. I cannot understand how a system, which has been adopted and followed with the best results by one class of the community, should be regarded as foolish when it is proposed to apply it to another class of the community. Would it be thought desirable by any hon. Member that his boy should continue at a private school after reaching the top of that school? Would it not be desirable that he should continue his education at a public school, passing from his classical extracts and smaller mathematical studies to the more difficult classics and the higher branches of mathematics, and that at the end of his school time he should again move, this time to the University? Surely there is an additional stimulus in a boy finding himself amid other youths doing different work from that he has been hitherto engaged in. Surely it gives him a fresh impulse in education if only from the change in his surroundings.

The local authorities will have to deal with some other schools of a special character. Some discussion has been raised upon evening schools, and the difficulties that will be felt in some classes of the community if these schools, giving education of a rudimentary character, are done away with. Boys and girls who should have learned the rudiments may have been sent to work at an early age, and may wish to recover the lost arts of reading and writing: they will be able to do so under the provisions of the Bill, but we do not want evening schools to move up from elementary and to deal with secondary education. Of course, it is well understood that it may constantly happen that in working for higher subjects old ground of a rudimentary character may be covered, but that is different from the sort of elementary education we wish to see confined to these evening schools. What the Government hope is that the elementary schools under the new system will be more efficacious, that children will not leave them in such a condition that they readily forget their school teaching, and that, consequently, the evening schools which are really of an elementary character will rapidly disappear.

It has been objected that there is no provision for the creation of secondary schools in rural districts for children who, after the age of fifteen, are able to stay at school, are capable of acquiring more information, and are worthy of a longer course of education. The Bill makes provision for that. If there is no available higher education in the neighbourhood of a rural school the local authority may provide higher education out of the money which is appropriated to elementary education, and the children, therefore, may stay on after the age of fifteen, and may be given education other than elementary—if there is no other available school—in the same school.

Power, too, is given to pay for and provide for the conveyance of teachers and of pupils from one school to another, and so we may say that we have brought a good and suitable education within the reach of all.

There is one other point. The local authority, before the provisions of this Bill, had no power to do anything for the training of teachers. We shall have that power in the future. In the case of all schools, colleges, or hostels provided by the education authority, the Cowper-Temple Clause will prevail. One of the great difficulties under which Nonconformists have laboured has been their exclusion from the training colleges. Of course the training colleges have been, with a few exceptions, of a denominational character; and for this reason Nonconformists have not merely been excluded from the higher teaching posts in the Church schools, where the trust deeds prevent the headmaster or headmistress from being anything but a member of the Church of England, but they have been excluded from the great board schools, because, owing to their inefficient training, they have not been able to aspire to these higher posts. Now, not only can the local authority provide undenominational training colleges, but if their resources are unequal to the provision of training collegesl they can provide undenominationa, hostels attached to denominational training colleges, where people can get training without incurring denominational liability.

The application of the Cowper-Temple Clause to the schools and colleges provided by the local education authority, has been the subject of some complaint.

I regard the Cowper-Temple Clause as a great safeguard to the local authorities. I feel that local authorities would spend much of their time in discussion as to whether they should or should not provide a school of a particular denomination, whereas where there exists the safeguard of the Cowper-Temple Clause that difficulty will not arise. I feel that the Cowper-Temple Clause, which is at best a very illogical and unsatisfactory safeguard for those who do not desire denominational teaching, has, at any rate, the merit that it protects local authorities from internal dissensions in regard to the establishment of schools.

Before I pass from the subject of secondary education there is one thing I should like to say as to the attitude of the Board of Education to these local authorities. Much has been said as to the probability that the Board of Education will take a line with regard to the local authorities which may be offensive to them, which may put pressure upon them to do what they were not otherwise disposed to do, and which might make them feel that they were not as independent as I think the House generally desires they should be. There are many ways in which the local authority are brought into contact with the Board of Education. There is, in the first place, the consultation with the Board of Education which is required of the local authority as to the educational needs of the area under Clause 2 of the Bill. There is the constitution of the education committee. One object of the Education Board will be to see that all the interests in an area that ought to be represented are represented. Another object which the Board will have in view is to take care that the education committees are not so broken up as to prevent co-ordination—to see that the education committees are not so constituted as to leave one wholly for secondary education and the other wholly for elementary education. Then there are the appeals which must come in the course of events from the managers to the Board of Education from the decisions of the local education authorities. Now, I may say for my noble friend the President of the Board of Education, as for myself, that it is our desire to co-operate as cordially as possible with the local authorities. Each will be able to contribute something. The one will bring their local knowledge and experience to bear on the subjects which they will have to consider in common. The Board of Education have a wider experience of education, and I have no doubt the Board of Education and the local authorities will work heartily together for the common end which they both have in view—the benefit of the young people in each area, to secure for them opportunity of success in life, and make their lives more full and interesting. In this way the two bodies will act together to promote the well-being of the whole community.

This is all I have to say on the secondary education part of the Bill, and I turn to elementary education and the constitution of the body which has charge of it. The hon. Member for Lincolnshire speaks of this part of the Bill as an attack on Nonconformity. I entirely repudiate that. I regard the Bill as an Education Bill, not as a measure designed either for the relief of the Church of England, or as an attack on Nonconformity, and I repudiate any such idea. The School Boards have passed away, and the local education authorities will take possession. Each local authority will find its area studded with schools of two sorts; the buildings of the one sort provided out of the rates, the buildings of the other sort provided out of private funds. They will incur responsibilities with regard to these two classes of schools. Their control over secular education will in all cases be complete and absolute, but in the case of the non-provided schools it will be limited in certain directions as regards religious instruction, and the managers will have an initiative in the appointment and dismissal of teachers. I am not going to argue or touch on the controversy which has raged so long in the House as to the composition of the board of management of the latter class of schools. We have already had fully explained the arrangements as to the buildings, the foundation managers, the right of appointing and dismissing teachers, and the maintenance of the fabric. The fabric will be maintained out of private contributions, out of endowments, out of fees, where fees are charged, and out of the rent of the teacher's house. I see no reason why these latter revenues, which are part of the revenues of the school as a building kept up by the denomination should be given up. These are matters which have been commented upon with great indignation. Sometimes they have been treated as petty, and one hon. Member described them as a huckstering demand on the part of the managers. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Hear, hear!"). I see the hon. Member still adheres to that description. The revenues are part of the revenues of the schools as built and kept up by the denomination. They are part of the property, and, for my own part, I see no reason why they should be given up. In the matter of fees the local authority can stop charging them. As regards the other matters the local authorities will benefit by the existence of teachers' houses and endowments wherever the endowments are appropriated to its own purposes.

Now, I should like, in passing, to say a word about the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. I shall not discuss the legal aspects, but some other aspects more particularly connected with it. It has been said that the Kenyon-Slaney Clause has been a great blow, a great injury, to the clergy. More than once in the course of the debate I have been told that I cannot really grasp the problems of education because I am a representative of a university, and am consequently said to be a representative and mouthpiece of the clergy. To my mind the representation of a university means something wider than the representation of the clergy. There are interests not exclusively clerical which every university, and necessarily the representative of a university, must consider as his peculiar charge, but in so far as I do represent the clergy, I am proud to represent a body of men who in the past have done, and now in the present are doing, so much for the religious education of the country. In the past they were our teachers all down the line of education, and they have now, I believe, abandoned the higher walks of education to laymen, largely because they have thrown themselves with greater force and enthusiasm into other departments of clerical life. Therefore the last thing I should desire to do would be to wound the feelings of the clergy in this particular department of clerical work. But, on the other hand demands have been put forward on behalf of the clergy which, I think, could hardly be the demands of the entire clerical world. It was stated by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, the other day, that the ordained ministry of the Church were the only persons entitled to teach its doctrines, and this with reference to the religious teaching in the public elementary schools. If that is true of a public elementary school, surely it carries us a little further. If no one but the clergyman may teach the doctrines of the Church, that is to say, if no one but the clergyman may attend to the teaching of the Catechism and the Prayer Book in a public elementary school, surely the same rule would apply to the home. If the lay manager and the lay teacher may not the one superintend and the other instruct in the Prayer Book and the Catechism, surely the same thing applies to the father and mother in the household. This, I think, is almost the *reductio ad absurdum* of that statement of the clerical case. But I do not think that is the view of the case taken by the bulk of the clergymen. What they feel is that hitherto they have had the sole superintendence, and like most men who have exercised power and feel that they have used it worthily, they do not wish to give it up. I do not think it is too much to ask the clergy, in the present conditions of elementary education, to exchange the sole superintendence which they now exercise for a joint superintendence with five other managers, three of whom are to be specially chosen from their own denomination, and specially constituted to protect the denominational teaching of which the clergyman has been in charge. My belief is that this Clause will in its working strengthen the position of the clergyman, and that, when the first irritation of this withdrawal of the sole superintendence from the clergy has passed by, we shall find that the boards of management of voluntary schools will work well, alike with the local authority which superintends the secular instruction and with the clerical member who is mainly interested in the religious instruction, although he is no longer the sole superintendent of it. That is all I have to say about a Clause which will, no doubt, confer upon its author a fame similar to that of the author of the celebrated Cowper-Temple Clause. The same element of legend will grow up around him as grew up around Cowper-Temple. I may mention that I have been more than once asked who were Cowper and Temple, what were their respective views, and how they were compromised. The author of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause will perhaps be regarded as two persons—one of them holding extreme Ritualistic views and the other extreme Nonconformist views, who eventually struck out a compromise which was accepted by the House.

The hon. Member for Cleveland, in a very interesting speech, made an allusion to these debates as prolonged. "Prolonged" is, to my mind, hardly an adequate expression. In fact, my vocabulary scarcely supplies me with any word which would convey an accurate description of my feelings with regard to the length of our debates. But, as has also been mentioned more than once tonight, these debates have been conducted in a friendly spirit, and the controversy, although prolonged and at times acute, has left no trace of bitterness behind it. Let me speak for my single self. In the middle of this Parliamentary battle I was brought into the fighting line, new to office and comparatively new to the life of the House of Commons, and I have experienced from both sides a consideration and an indulgence for which I should like to express my gratitude in the heartiest terms I can command.

In regard to the religious difficulty, my own belief is that under the great difficulties of the existence of the voluntary schools in these large numbers, and the real desire which, in spite of all that has been said, I believe to exist, that there should be definite denominational teaching—a desire the best proof of which is the continued existence, during all these thirty years of struggle and conflict, of these thousands of voluntary schools—my own belief is that in the circumstances the solution provided by the Government is the best and fairest that could be found. The hon. Member for Oldham has said that if the upper classes would take a more serious view of life there would be less need for denominational teaching in the elementary schools. I cannot accept that solution, nor am I prepared to say that we have found the ultimate solution of our difficulty. I accept this solution as the best which the present circumstances will allow; but I look for another solution at a future time. Some day we shall realise that religion is and always must be an integral part of education, and at the same time that our religious differences will always exist in a nation which is a really serious nation and which takes its religious differences seriously. We shall also realise that these differences ought to be accepted and must be understood. For this reason I do not regret what has been regretted in some of the criticisms made on this Bill, that we shall bring the different denominations together in the Education Committee. The more they jostle one another in the common interests of education the more rapidly will they learn to understand one another, to appreciate one another, and to see the common good which underlies all their differences. The differences will not disappear, but they will lose their bitterness because they will be understood. That, I hope, will be the end and the solution of this great educational and religious problem. It will not come this year or next year, but I for one will never despair that it will come, and then the religious question will not be the great educational difficulty. Rather, we shall see religion set to education "like perfect music unto noble words," and at last in the fulness of time there will descend upon our schools the blessing of peace.

(11.40.) DR. MACNAMARA: I desire to express my sincere admiration of the manner in which the First Lord of the Treasury has acted during the proceedings on this Bill. His exquisite courtesy and unfailing good temper will always remain a pleasant memory, although they must be associated with a matter on which we sincerely differ. I am glad that his patience has lasted so long, but I could have wished that it had sasted to the end of Clause 20, so that we might have had an opportunity of going into those repealing Clauses which touch matters of great importance, and not consequential upon anything that has transpired during the Committee or other stage of this Bill. But the First Lord told us that there was nothing for it but to apply the Closure by compartments. I think we might have made a better Bill if we had had a little longer time for discussion. Whatever might be said of the merits of the Bill, I would like to say that it has worked something in the nature of a modern miracle during the eight months it has been before the House and the country. I say modern miracle advisedly. It has created on the part of the English people something in the nature of an interest in the education question. The English people up to the present time have had little or no belief in intellectualism as a factor of national defence. They have won their way to superiority by physical superiority almost entirely in the past, but they will not do it in the future. However superior physically they may be, other forces are at work. I think that John Bull does not connote the enormous changes that are going on all around. This Bill, with all its defects on its head, and there are many, has awakened him to the importance of national education, and the gravity of it from the point of view of national defence, and to that extent it is really a blessing in disguise. That is my deliberate judgment upon it. But when it goes into the localities I am bound to confess that I see it must be associated with very much irritation, because it cuts across so many of the traditions of our educational system. That irritation will not subside for some time. All that is good. So long as we can keep John Bull awake we have a priceless stimulus. I believe the result of keeping him awake on this subject will be that he will make enormous changes in this Bill. I think a decade will not pass over our heads until that will happen. I am perfectly grateful for the Bill from the fact that it has aroused the interest of the people of this country. I cannot come up in the train without hearing people discussing the Education Bill. I cannot help wondering what the good people of Sevenoaks thought things were coming to that they should have an election fought entirely on the education question. I believe that if we can keep that interest alive all the bad things in the Bill will be driven out under the irresistible force of public opinion.

I should like to turn to two or three of the main principles of the Bill, and to say a word or two on each. First of all in regard to the new machinery for local education in this country. The Government has determined to go to the municipal councils for their local authorities for education in the future. I said on the First Reading that there was nothing anti-democratic in that. I understand that it was the original form of the Bill which Mr. Gladstone placed before the Cabinet in 1869, and which Mr. Forster introduced in 1870. The proposal was not to create an *ad hoc* body, but to make the municipal councils the local authority for elementary education. The *ad hoc* authority was the result of an Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, and supported by the hon. Member for Oxford University. Why does the Government go to the municipal council for the local authority for education? From the point of view of a good many of us on this side of the House, we cannot help feeling that, however desirable it may be to bring the control of education into the general field of municipal activity, we think it should be accorded a separate election and a separate franchise. There is at the back of many of us this sort of feeling, that when education is handed over to the municipal council, which has a thousand and one other things to attend to, it is likely to be slowed down and overlooked, and not so likely to be prosecuted with that enthusiasm and vigour with which it would be prosecuted if left to the control of a body exclusively elected for education, and nothing else. There is a feeling among the Progressives that that is the reason why the Government have gone to the Municipal Council for the local council for education. If that is the view of the Government I believe it is doomed to complete disappointment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

DR. MACNAMARA: I do not think for a moment that the Municipal Councils, with their local patriotism and their desire to promote education in their own centres, will try to slow down education. Remember we can only judge of those points by what they have done in the past. I do not think we can pay the present Ministry the credit of being enthusiastic on the subject of elementary education in this country. The last of the Vice-Presidents of the Council will tell you frankly that the members of the Government are composed of an aristocratic class who do not believe in higher education for the children of the people, being perfectly convinced that there are certain functions in civilised life which are best performed by ignorant people. I believe that in the administration of the counties for some time there will be a disposition to slow things down, but I do not think for a moment that the great municipalities of the north of England—Leeds, Bradford, Manchester, and Liverpool—are likely to be less progressive in the work of education than would be a School Board elected for the same area. Would Ministers tell us if this is the reason? One reason they suggest is that they want to get rid of a number of elections. We have heard tonight that there are too many elections, and that people are sick and tired of them. We are prepared to meet the Government on that issue. You could have elected an *ad hoc* body for education on the same day and on the same franchise as you elect your Municipal Council.

The First Lord says that one of the desires of the Government in giving the work to the Municipal Councils, and this of course is quite a sincere desire, is that it would be possible to bring all grades of education under one authority in the same area. That is an admirable reason, and I agree with it entirely. If you are to have an educational ladder in use you can only have it by co-ordinating the different grades of education, and so long as there are separate authorities you cannot have complete co-ordination. It is desirable and expedient that you should have all grades of schools under one authority in the same area. I agree entirely as to the essentiality of that. But when I remember how very little we hear of the blessed word co-ordination now-a-days I cannot help recalling to mind the highly-coloured play bills that depict the Surrey side drama. I would say to the Government, "Live up to the poster." In the First Lord's First Reading speech he spoke of co-ordination, but I confess I do not hear much about it now. I can put the First Lord's position in a sentence more succinctly than by quoting from any speech. It is a statement contained in a letter written to the hon. Member for North West Ham. In that letter the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The Government quite recognise that until both primary and secondary education in each district are confid d to a single education authority, we cannot regard our educational system as properly organised."

That is the whole position taken up by the Government—a position in which I most entirely and thoroughly agree. What has been done to live up to that poster? It is true that this Bill provides us with an authority for all grades of education in counties and boroughs. You have got under Clause 1 of the Bill 129 authorities which live up to this ideal of co-ordination. But you have got a great deal more than that which do not live up to the poster by any means. You have the proviso of Clause 1 of which I moved the rejection in Committee and of which I stand a pronounced opponent. I am sorry for the difficulty in which the First Lord finds himself, and I should have been glad if he had shown more courage and had lived up to his own testimony for one authority for all grades of education.

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 3rd December, 1902.

THE EARL WALDEGRAVE
Sat Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Standing Order No. XXXIX, considered (according to order), and suspended for Tomorrow's sitting.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 192.)

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a this afternoon. (No. 191.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Twelve o'clock a.m. till half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 3rd December, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

PETITIONS.

VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Edgbaston, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 373 (Jamaica, Report for 1901-2) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Civil Service—Boy Copyists' Examinations —Irish Centres.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Civil Service Commissioners will consider the advisability of including the city of Londonderry in their list of centres for boy copyists' examinations, seeing that at present Londonderry is a centre for Excise and Customs examinations, and that the nearest centre at which candidates from Londonderry for the position of boy copyists can present themselves for examination is Belfast.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) I am informed by the Civil Service Commissioners that they have frequently considered the advisability of making the proposed change, but that they have come to the conclusion that it would be undesirable. The number of centres in Ireland is the same as in England and Scotland.

Indian Military Pensions—Payment in England or India—Rate of Exchange.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will arrange that widows in the receipt of pensions from the old military funds while residing in India may be allowed to draw their pensions through their agents in England; and if he will state whether any expense or loss to the Indian Exchequer would be caused by the arrangement.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) On the 1st March, 1900, in reply to a similar Question,† I pointed out to my hon. friend that the present arrangements are exceptionally favourable to annuitants, and informed him that I was not prepared to sanction the payment in England of these pensions at sterling rates during the residence in India of the annuitants for more than one year. Such an arrangement would have the effect of increasing the burden on the revenues of India, and I regret that I must adhere to the decision already announced.

Irish Lights—Tuns Bank, Lough Foyle.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any steps have been as yet taken by the Irish Lights Board towards the erection of a gas and bell buoy at the Tuns Banks, Lough Foyle.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

---

† See (4) *Debates*, lxxix., 1425.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that the buoy is now in hand and it is hoped that it will be installed during next summer.

Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, seeing that the guarantee of the Donegal Grand Jury for portion of the capital required for the construction of the new railway from Buncrana to Carndonagh only ran from the opening of the line for traffic, and that the appointment of arbitrators, as required by Section 6 of The Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, was not made by the Board of Trade during the continuance of said guarantee, will he say if, before the appointment of said arbitrators, any assurance was received from the railway company that the terms of the presentment of the Grand Jury had been carried out, and that the guarantee had begun to run.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Under the provisions of Section 11 of the Order authorising the railway, the guarantee is applicable to so much of the capital, not exceeding £5,000, as is for the time being paid up. As I have already stated in reply to a Question on this subject on Friday last, the Board of Trade, before appointing arbitrators, received an assurance that the capital authorised had been raised, and in these circumstances no further assurance seems, so far as the appointment of arbitrators is concerned, to have been necessary.

India—Conduct of 9th Lancers at Sialkote.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the date of the report from the officer commanding the 9th Lancers contained in a telegram from the Government of India, and whether any evidence has since been forthcoming in the case referred to in that report.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The report in question is referred to in a public statement issued by the Government of India in India. I quoted the exact words given, but I am unable to give the date of the report. Nor am I in possession of any information about the case that I have not already given the House.

Telegraphists' Promotions in London Central Office.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a telegraphist in the Central Office, London, has been selected for the post of senior clerk, although thirty skilled operators were senior to him; whether, in view of the official declaration that good conduct, manipulative ability, and seniority are alone necessary for this position, he will state the grounds for this selection; and whether the telegraphists senior to the one selected by the Controller are to receive any recognition of their service as operating telegraphists.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I fear I must again ask the hon. Member to refer to my answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Hoxton on the 13th ultimo,† which comprises all that I can say on this subject.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the fact that officials of the permanent staff of the Controller of the Central Telegraphs have been promoted recently to important administrative positions in the instrument gallery because of their special supervising abilities, he will state where these officers acquired their technical and practical knowledge; whether either of them has previously supervised in the instrument gallery of the Central Office; and whether one of the men promoted has for twenty-eight years been engaged on clerical duties remote from the instrument galleries.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have already informed the hon. Member, in answer to a Question which he put to me on the 27th November, that I selected for promotion the officers who were in my opinion best fitted for the duties of their new posts. I must respectfully decline to discuss their qualifications further by way of question and answer in this House.

---

† See preceding volume, page 859.

South Africa—Education in the New Colonies.

MR. CHAPMAN (Cheshire, Hyde): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he can state what provisions are made for elementary education in the two States of South Africa recently added to His Majesty's Dominions, and whether he will state what measures are taken to protect the religious beliefs of the children; and, further, if he can state the number of schools in existence at the outbreak of the war.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Free primary education is given; and the syllabus of instruction adopted to start with has been that in use in Cape Colony. Attendance is not compulsory. As far as possible provision has been made in all schools under Government control for imparting religious instruction in accordance with the wishes of parents. I cannot state the exact number of schools existing at the moment of the outbreak of war, but the number of scholars was very considerably less than it has been since the Colonies were annexed.

London and Globe Finance Corporation.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, in view of the nature of the transactions disclosed before the official receiver during the liquidation of the London and Globe Finance Corporation, he has come to a final decision as to the action to be taken in the matter; and, if not, whether he can state when such decision will be arrived at.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) This case was fully considered last summer, and I came to the conclusion that the case was not one which should be taken up by the Director of Public Prosecutions. Some further Papers have, I am informed, been transmitted to him within the last few days, and they will be considered in due course.

Drafts for the 9th Lancers.

COLONEL LEGGE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many drafts of the 9th Lancers have been sent out to India this year, the strength of each draft, and the dates of their departure from England and arrival in India; and whether any further drafts are to be sent out during the present trooping season.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I think an inconvenient precedent would be made if details of drafts joining particular regiments were given, and, as much labour would be entailed on the officers concerned if such demands became general, I fear I must ask the hon. and gallant Member to forego the information.

London Irish Rifle Volunteers.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a service officer to the vacant command of the London Irish Rifle Volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No official information has reached the War Office that the present officer commanding the London Irish Rifle Volunteers is retiring.

Education Bill—Clause 18 (2)—Date of Coming into Operation.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Board contemplate bringing the Education (England and Wales) Bill, if passed into law, into operation for any county before the scheme for establishing the education committee of the local education authority has been approved by the Board.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) In matters which, under Clause 18 (2), stand referred to the education committee, I doubt whether it would be practicable, even if it were desirable, for the Board to go beyond the preliminary stages of discussion and consultation before the scheme for that Committee has been approved by the Board.

Education Bill—County Council Rating for Salaries, &c.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it will be in the power of a County Council, before the appointed day under the Education (England and Wales) Bill, to levy a rate for the monthly or weekly payments for salaries, &c., for which they will then become liable.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) It is true that the County Council will have the power referred to, but I have no reason to think that there will be any necessity for the exercise of the power.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Articles of Peace—Boer Protest to Lord Kitchener.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he will lay upon the Table or inform the House of the contents of the written protest delivered by the Boer Generals to Lord Kitchener at the time the Articles of Peace were signed.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) (for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): I would refer the hon. Member to p. 158 of Cd. 1163.

War Commission.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Commission will take evidence as to the manner in which the young soldiers endured the hardships of the campaign and withstood the attack of disease.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper:—

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on the South African War, and in view of the fact that General Sir Redvers Buller was Adjutant General of the Army from 1st October, 1890 to 30th September, 1897, he will use his influence to secure the calling of General Buller to give evidence before the Commission.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): In reply to these two Question, I am desired by my right hon. friend to say that the nature of the evidence called for by the Royal Commission rests entirely with that body. My right hon. friend has no influence whatever in the matter.

Strength of Regular Army at Home.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total number of men now serving in the Regular Army at home, the number of men under twenty years of age, and the number of men under two years' service; and whether men under the age of twenty are returned as effectives.

LORD STANLEY: The figures for non-commissioned officers and men on 1st November were as follows:—Total strength 145,668; under two years' service 50,820; under twenty years of age 33,551. All soldiers on the strength of their units are considered as effectives, whether under twenty years of age or not.

Volunteer Officers and War Rewards.

MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will cause further inquiry to be made as to the rewards bestowed upon officers of Volunteer companies for their services; and, seeing that only four were rewarded out of over 500 who served in South Africa with Volunteer companies and Engineer detachments, will he state how many South African and over-sea Colonial Officers were awarded the D.S.O. and other decorations.

LORD STANLEY: The number of Colonial troops employed in all amounted approximately to 80,000. 338 over-sea and South African Colonial Officers were rewarded. I cannot make any statement with regard to further rewards to the officers of Militia and Volunteers who served in the war.

Argentina—The Murder of Mr. William Barnett.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what reasons have been given by the Government of the Argentine Republic for the sentence passed upon the murderer of Mr. William Barnett; and if His Majesty's Government will make representations to the Government of the Argentine Republic on the subject of the appeal lodged by the culprit against the sentence passed upon him.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): Grau, the murderer of Mr Barnett has been sentenced to only eight years' imprisonment, and his accomplice to only one year's arrest. It is the solicitor for the prosecution who has appealed. The sentence is based on the opinion of the judge that there was no premeditation, and that Grau had not improperly assumed police authority. His extreme youth was also taken into consideration. His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Buenos Aires telegraphs that he is awaiting fuller reports relative to the case, and if there are good grounds for it he will make a strong representation against the sentence.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: May I ask whether, in view of the lenity of the sentence, the Government will make a further demand on the Argentine Government for the better security of British subjects in future.

LORD CRANBORNE: The solicitor for the prosecution has lodged an appeal; and while the Chargé d'Affaires is waiting for a special Report it is impossible to take any steps.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether in view of Article II. of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Russia, of 12th January 1859, which binds this country not to place other or higher duties on any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of Russian dominions than on those of any other foreign country, and not to prohibit the importation of any such articles, and of Article X. which binds this country to grant to Russian subjects every privilege, favour, and immunity granted to subjects of any other Power, it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to give notice of the expiration of that treaty in order to place itself in a position to carry out the Sugar Convention, Brussels; and whether, in view of Article XXII. of the Treaty of 1859, which stipulates that the treaty shall remain in force until twelve months after either party thereto shall have given notice to the other to terminate the same, such notice has already been given by His Majesty's Government; and, if not, how His Majesty's Government propose to place themselves in a position to give effect to the Sugar Convention as therein stipulated on 1st September 1903.

LORD CRANBORNE: In the opinion of His Majesty's Government the imposition of countervailing duties upon, or the prohibition of the importation of, bounty-fed sugar is not inconsistent with the provisions of the most-favoured-nation Clause. The Russian Government were informed in 1899 when the Government of India had imposed countervailing duties against sugar imported from Russia, that this was the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, and that if the Russian Government were unable to agree in this view Her Majesty's Government were prepared to denounce the Treaty of Commerce of 1859. No reply was made to this communication.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I may gather that as a matter of fact no notice has at present been given to terminate the treaty of 1859?

LORD CRANBORNE: Will my hon. friend put the Question on the Paper?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I have put it on the Paper.

LORD CRANBORNE: What we have said is that we were ready to denounce the treaty if the Russian Government wished it, and no answer has been received.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then it has not been denounced?

LORD CRANBORNE: No.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Seeing that twelve months notice has to be given, what operation will that have upon the coming into effect of the Sugar Convention?

LORD CRANBORNE: I have already said that in the opinion of His Majesty's Government the imposition of countervailing duties or the prohibition of bounty-fed sugar is not inconsistent with the most-favoured-nation Clause.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Is that founded on legal advice?

LORD CRANBORNE: Of course it is.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: As the Russian Government hold a contrary opinion, what measures have His Majesty's Government taken to reconcile the two opinions?

LORD CRANBORNE: It would be inconsistent with practice to answer a supplementary Question of that kind. But we have offered to denounce the treaty of 1859.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given private notice. It is whether the noble Lord is aware that the Dutch Minister of Finance stated yesterday in the Dutch Second Chamber that England will be bound by the terms of the Convention to levy countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar from her autonomous Colonies and British India; whether he can say that any, or which, of the States who signed the Convention have adopted a policy similar to that mentioned by the Dutch Minister of Finance; and whether there are any other points or articles in the Convention on which any of the other contracting parties have adopted a different construction from that of His Majesty's Government.

LORD CRANBORNE: I only received notice of the Question a short time ago. If the hon. Member will be good enough to put the Question on the Paper I shall be delighted to give an answer.

Sugar Bounties and the Shipping Trade.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Hull, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his Department has statistics to show the probable effect of the ratification of the Sugar Bounties Convention on the shipping trade carried on with bounty-fed sugar in entire or part cargoes from the near Continental ports, and what portion of the sugar imported into the United Kingdom is at present in receipt of bounties; also what is the comparison of the short sea route freights from the Continental ports as against the long sea route from the West Indies.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds Central): If the Brussels Convention i ratified, all the principal Continental countries from which we import sugar will cease to grant bounties, so that no sudden diminution is to be expected in the shipping normally employed in carrying such sugar. Should the Convention result in our eventually drawing a larger proportion of our supply of sugar from more distant sources, the total employment of shipping will be increased. About nine-tenths of our imports of sugar at present come from bounty-giving countries. I am informed that the rates of freight for raw sugar to this country from Hamburg and the West Indies are from about 5s. to 7s. 6d. a ton, and from 20s. to 25s. a ton respectively.

Bath Hospital Drainage.

MR. BARLOW (Somersetshire, Frome): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to a letter, dated 1st September, 1902, from the Bath Rural District Board complaining of the system of drainage lately adopted by the Bath Statutory Hospital authorities, because of the danger it causes to the water supply of Monkton Combe, and asking that an inquiry may be instituted; and, having regard also to a letter or petition to the Local Government Board, dated 23rd September, 1902, from the parish of Monkton Combe to the same effect, and asking that an inspector may be sent down, whether he will state why an inspector has not been sent, and when one will be sent.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): I received a letter from the Rural District Council on the 2nd September last calling attention to this matter and asking for my advice thereon, or for an inquiry, if this was deemed expedient. I at once communicated with the Bath Town Council, who explained the arrangements they had recently made for the disposal of the sewage of their hospital, and stated that if it was found necessary after a proper trial further to treat the effluent or adopt any modification of the system, this would be done by the Council. Subsequently, I received further complaints in the matter, and on the 20th of last month I addressed a communication to the Town Council urging them to deal with the sewage so as to obviate any above-ground nuisance, and stating that if it appeared, after investigation by a geological expert, that there was risk of dangerous contamination of the springs and wells in the neighbourhood from the present system of sewage disposal, measures should be at once taken to remedy this. In reply, the Town Council have promised that this letter shall receive early attention. They state that certain defects pointed out by the Medical Officer of Health of the Rural District Council have been remedied, and that the system is now working satisfactorily. It does not seem to me to be necessary at the present moment to hold an inquiry on the subject; but the hon. Member may rest assured that I shall not lose sight of the matter.

"The Parliamentary Debates"—Terms of the New Contract.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that in evidence before the Select Committee on Reporting in 1893, the Controller of the Stationery Office gave the number and amounts of the tenders for the Parliamentary Debates in 1889 and 1892, there is any objection to stating the numbers and amounts of the tenders received for the contract commencing with next Session; or whether he will state the amounts of the two highest and the two lowest tenders received.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham): No, Sir. The usual rule is to treat unaccepted tenders as confidential, and the exception made in the case of evidence before a Select Committee does not constitute a precedent for disclosing them by way of Question and answer in the House of Commons.

Captain NORTON: Will the hon. Gentleman state the figure quoted by Messrs. Wyman in their first tender, and was theirs the lowest figure?

Mr. HAYES FISHER: No, Sir, I do not think I can give that information.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the circumstances under which the tenders, invited in July last, for the Parliamentary Debates contract were superseded in the following month by new tenders, and what were the nature and significance of the differences between the two forms of tender; and will he explain the reason of the omission from Clause 4 of the tender of the condition contained in the expiring contract, that in obtaining such reports the contractor shall conform to the Resolution passed by the House of Commons on 13th February, 1891, and renewed on 21st March 1893, and of the provision contained in former contracts that the contractor shall have, at all times when either House is sitting, representatives in attendance, capable of reporting in full when necessary.

Mr. HAYES FISHER: The first form of invitation to tender was withdrawn as, when tenders were received, it appeared that there had been some misunderstanding on the part of some of the tenderers of the intention of the following words appearing in Clause 5: "A tender for one of the Schemes only will be accepted." Two firms misinterpreting the intention submitted tenders for one Scheme only, understanding that they were not at liberty to submit tenders for more. In the form of tender as re-submitted all possibility of misunderstandings of the kind was removed by alteration in the wording. As regards the second Question, Condition 12 of the new Contract requires that the contractor "shall in all respects conform" to the Resolutions referred to. To speak of them as specially applicable to one part only of the work covered by the Contract seemed to weaken the injunction, and the last words were accordingly struck out of Clause 4. The provision "that the contractor shall have at all times when either House is sitting, representatives in attendance capable of reporting in full when necessary," did not appear either in the Contract with Mr. Bussy, which commenced with the session of 1898, or in the Contract now expiring with Messrs Wyman. It is replaced by the stipulations contained in Clause 4 of the present Contract.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in the former Contract, besides the Fair Wage Resolution being mentioned in Clause 12, it was also specially referred to in Clause 4; that the reporters have only now been given a sort of general protection, whereas formerly they were specially protected?

MR. HAYES FISHER: I am not aware of that.

Crofts in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Crofters Commission, in their Report on the social condition of the people of Lewis, state that the Sections of the Crofters Act, which deal with the enlargement of holdings, have in Lewis remained almost a dead letter; and will he state what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I hope the hon. Member will allow me to refer him to the answer given yesterday to his Question on the subject of this Report.†

MR. WEIR: Am I to understand that the matter is being considered by the Secretary for Scotland?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Report raises many questions, and my noble friend cannot possibly deal with specific suggestions by way of Question and answer. In good time he will, however, be prepared to announce the general policy of the Board.

Landless Cottars in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the Crofters' Commission in their Report on the social condition of the people of Lewis express the opinion that the landless cottars, or squatters, form a burden on almost every crofting township in the Island, will he say how he proposes to meet the difficulty.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I can only refer the hon. Member to the answer given yesterday to his Question on the subject of this Report.

Teaching of Trades and Handicrafts in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the recommendations of the Crofters' Commission in their Report on the social condition of the people of Lewis, in favour of establishing and fostering technical instruction for the teaching of trades and handicrafts and the elements of scientific avocations, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of communicating with the Treasury and Board of Education on the subject, with a view to funds being provided for these purposes in the Estimates for the ensuing year.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member is probably aware that the operations of the Board of Education, which is an English Board, do not extend to the Lews. The Scotch Education Department, in arranging the estimates for the next financial year with the Treasury, will endeavour to see that an adequate amount is provided to enable the Department to meet the various grants claimable under its rules.

Higher Commercial Education in Scotland.

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrewshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the fact that at present leaving certificates can be obtained by scholars, irrespective of age, who pass either in English, mathematics, Latin and Greek, or in English, mathematics, practical science, and either French or

---

† See page 922.

German, or in English, mathematics, French and German, and that under Circular 340, of January, 1902, no candidate after 1904 can obtain a leaving certificate unless he is seventeen years of age, and no certificate will be granted for English, mathematics, French and German except an intermediate certificate which may be taken by candidates over fifteen years of age; and whether he can give some assurance with a view to prevent the discouragement of higher commercial education which it has been the policy of the Scotch Education Department to encourage in recent years.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: As indicated in circulars more recently issued, the Department proposes to institute a commercial certificate for pupils of a higher age. In such a certificate modern languages, as studied for the practical purposes of commerce, will receive full recognition, in accordance with the policy which the Department has for some years pursued with good results.

Fever in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that the outbreak of typhus and typhoid fever at North Tolsta, Island of Lewis, has already resulted in upwards of fifty cases, as many as six persons in one family being affected; will he state what steps are being taken to stamp out the disease, whether the patients are isolated; and if so, where.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The numbers mentioned in my answer given on 20th November † referred to the period since 1st October only. In the early summer the cases were so mild that they attracted little attention, but when they proved to be infectious the local authority instituted an inspection, saw that all isolation practicable was carried out, strongly urged ablution of persons, and supplied disinfectants. In cases of typhoid fever, drains were cleaned out. Tolsta, being thirteen miles distant from Stornoway, removal to hospital was not considered advisable, especially in view of the difficulties of transit in such a district.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are no means of isolating fever patients at this place, where there are only mud cabins. Will he further inquire?

[No answer was returned.]

Stornoway Mail Service

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that although the Stornoway and Kyle mail service was established for the carriage of passengers and goods as well as for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails, Messrs. MacBrayne, the contractors, frequently decline to convey goods from Stornoway to Kyle, on the ground that there is not sufficient time for their delivery before proceeding to Mallaig; and will he consider the expediency of communicating with Messrs. MacBrayne on the subject.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member himself and others interested in the West Coast services have frequently complained of delays to the mails, which have on examination been shown to be due to the attempt of the contractors to provide facilities for the shipment of cargo, and under these circumstances I am not encouraged to make such representations as the hon. Gentleman now suggests.

Irish Marine Store Dealers.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the desire expressed by commercial bodies in Ireland that marine store dealers and second-hand dealers generally should be registered and licensed, he will at the earliest opportunity introduce a Bill to amend the law in this respect.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I hope to be able to introduce legislation in this matter next year.

Swords Borough Schools.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at an examination for an Exhibition, to be competed for by the pupils of the Old and New Borough Schools at Swords, recently conducted by Mr. Michael Sullivan, LL.B., and Mr. T. P. O'Connor, B.A., respectively, a Senior and District Inspector of National Schools, the answering of Michael Keegan was superior to that of any other candidate, and that the examiners failed to return his name as a successful candidate, alleging that he was not properly qualified; and, seeing that the Commissioners of National Education made an order, on 14th October, instructing the examiners that the boy, Michael Keegan, was a qualified candidate, and that the examiners have refused to alter their decision, whether he will take steps to secure in future obedience to the scheme.

---

† See page 22.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are accurately stated. The scheme framed for the management of these endowed schools provides that the decision of the examiners upon any question in respect of the qualification of a candidate shall be final. No change in the procedure under the scheme could be effected except by legislation. The propriety of altering the procedure in this respect will not be lost sight of in the event of legislation being introduced.

Private Bills.

MR. WEIR: May I ask whether the Government intend to take any action with regard to the Report of the Select Committee on Private Bills?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understood the Report was only circulated yesterday morning, and therefore it is quite impossible for the Government to give any opinion as to the course which they ought to take in consequence of the findings of the Committee.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 385.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

[THIRD READING SECOND DAY'S DEBATES.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed to Question [2nd December], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

(2.35.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): When my speech was interrupted at the close of the sitting last night I was expressing my regret that the Government have thought it necessary to depart from the principle of one authority for all grades of education. Perhaps I may be allowed to read a sentence from a speech made by the Prime Minister, with which I desire to entirely associate myself—

> "The Government quite recognise that until both primary and secondary education in each district are confided to a single education authority we cannot regard our educational system as properly organised."

I am sorry that the Bill in its career through the Committee stage has so seriously departed from that admirable principle. We have one authority for all grades of education—financial, administrative, and autonomous for every county borough, but I regret very much that the Government have found it necessary to depart from the principle by giving autonomy for purely elementary education, while secondary education is to be administered by the county centre to municipal boroughs of over 10,000 and urban districts with over 20,000 population. And much more than that I regret the fact that when Clause 3 was being discussed the Prime Minister acquiesced in the suggestion that miserable boroughs of under 10,000 and urban districts under 20,000 might, if they desired and cared to raise 1d. over and above the 2d. county rate, have autonomy to that extent over higher education. The result is this, that, starting with 129 authorities—county boroughs and administrative counties having autonomy for all purposes — we immediately proceed to create 201 authorities other than the 129 which will be autonomous for elementary but not for higher education, and 853 which will be autonomous in a measure for higher but not for elementary education. You have 1,183 authorities of one sort or another, and that is, I think, a serious departure from the reasonable ideal set before us by the Prime Minister in the words I have just quoted. I know that the right hon. Gentleman has no doubt been compelled to take this course by political exigencies rather than by educational expediency, but I do not suppose that the people in the localities will act with the maximum stupidity. Indeed, I hope they will not, and that the bad effects of this policy will be mitigated by the good sense of the people who will locally have to administer this scheme. I have no objection to municipalising the control of education. I think it is desirable wherever it is practicable, but it is not practicable in the great county boroughs. Take the case of Leeds. There you have 700 or 800 school departments of various kinds. You have, roughly speaking, 3,000 teachers and 100,000 pupils of one sort or another. You have an annual expenditure of at least half-a-million sterling, an expenditure which is bound to increase with the growth of population. What will be the result if you hand over that work to the Municipal Council? If the scheme of municipalisation is genuine, it must be agreed that in the urban districts a majority of the Education committee shall be members of the Municipal Council. That is the Birmingham League Scheme of which we have heard so much, and you are bound to it, or otherwise your scheme is spurious. Now, in a great city like Leeds the councillors are hard-worked business men, and the stupendous detailed public work entailed by this Bill would fall necessarily into the hands, first of all, of officials and, secondly, into the hands of a number of persons who are not directly responsible to the ratepayers who find the money. That is the greatest educational leap in the dark which the country has ever taken. I think the time must come when the county boroughs will come to Parliament and ask for a revival, in some form or another, of the *ad hoc* body for educational purposes, and in order to meet the objection of the multiplication of elections agree that their *ad hoc* body shall be constituted on the same date, the same voting paper, and in the same wards as the Municipal Council. It is my profound belief that that will happen.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word or two about the question of finance. I am profoundly thankful to the Government for having had the courage to recognise once for all that the hopeless endeavour to maintain elementary education by voluntary contributions should be entirely departed from. It has, I think, been a matter of common agreement that the voluntary schools cannot compete with schools supported out of the rates, and I am therefore glad that the Government have decided that they shall be no longer left dependent on voluntary subscription or on the goodwill and charity of residents in the locality. In the first place, that brings under contribution for elementary education £60,000,000 of the rateable value of the country, which up to the present time has escaped any contribution in that form. I am delighted that the ratepayers of Preston, Stockport, Eastbourne, Cheltenham, Bournemouth, Lincoln, Chester, St. Helens, and 120 other towns will now be compelled to bear their due share of what I believe to be a communal obligation. In the past they have shuffled out of it on the ground that they dislike the school board system of religious instruction, and that they prefer denominational instruction. I believe that is only true of a small number of the 128 towns. In many places, no doubt, some people have paid more than they need have done for the upkeep of the denominational schools, but so far as the bulk of the ratepayers is concerned the preference has been not for this or that form of religious instruction but for a system which will enable them to escape any contribution to the rates. The people of Preston have got their hearts' desire; they have denominational teaching under this Bill, and I am going to watch with what cheerfulness they will pay for it now that they have to do it out of the rates. It strikes me that when they find that denominational schools are just as expensive as undenominational schools have been they will love one about as little as they have loved the other in the past. I view with entire satisfaction the placing of public elementary schools on public funds and the universalisation of local rates.

I am tired of allowing people to contract themselves out of their communal obligations.

One of the immediate results of the passing of this Bill will be the necessity to overhaul the Education Code, which such matters as the staffing has been fixed with due regard to the poverty of the voluntary schools. What are the provisions of this year's Code in regard to the staffing of the schools? Each certificated head-teacher is held responsible for an average attendance of fifty children, which may mean anything up to seventy-five children on the school roll; each certificated assistant is responsible for an average attendance of sixty children—or about eighty children on the roll—and each ex-pupil-teacher is responsible for an average of forty-five, representing probably sixty on the roll. Then there is another class of young person, of whom there are some 17,000 at work in our voluntary schools—and I think it is a scandal that it should be so—a young person who has no qualification whatever except that she can assure the Inspector of Schools that she is over eighteen and has been vaccinated; this class of teacher is responsible for thirty children in average attendance, or anything up to forty-five on the roll. Thus at the present time in the voluntary schools of England and Wales there is only one certificated teacher for every 103 children in average attendance, which means that the classes are unteachably and cruelly large. The excuse of poverty which has hitherto been the ground for fixing that low standard now disappears, and therefore I urge that we must have an overhauling of the Education Code so as to bring us into something like line with the other great civilised countries of Europe as well as the United States of America, where classes of sixty, seventy, eighty, and ninety are never seen. The least we can ask is that the classes shall be reduced to something like manageable proportions.

I come to the question of the management of denominational schools. Rate aid materially involves absolutely full rate control. I have no anxiety as to that, for I am sure that the public, which now has to find eleven-twelfths of the cost of education, will in a short time demand more than four-twelfths of the representation on the management. So far as the majority of foundation managers is concerned, I look upon the scheme of the Prime Minister as a futile rampart of sand erected on the shore against an incoming tide. I do not see how the Government can expect to limit the representatives of the ratepayers to two out of six. My position was admirably summed up by Lord Selborne who, when asked in 1895 why the Archbishop's Committee did not recommend rate aid, said that—

> "He looked with the greatest fear to their having to take any such course as that of claiming a share of the rates. That, in his opinion, would be a most suicidal policy to adopt, for it would be handing themselves over body and soul to the enemy."

The noble Lord will no doubt today content himself with the reflection that "Adversity makes strange bed-fellows." I feel sure that the time will come very soon when the four-twelfths representation will be held not to be an adequate return for the eleven-twelfths public aid. I wish next to say a few words on Clause 7, sub-Section 5, which is to be handed down to posterity as the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. I think that that Clause is an admirable addition to this Bill. It will no doubt be very rarely operative, but when it is applied it will prove a very efficacious correction to the vagaries of a few extreme clericals who are connected with our schools. Only this morning I had occasion to go into the details of a case which I believe the Kenyon-Slaney case will exactly meet. It is the case of the village of Billesdon, Leicestershire, the vicar of which has quite recently mysteriously developed High Church tendencies. The vicar one day went into the school—a Church school—where the schoolmaster worked hard for twenty years giving Church teaching to the satisfaction of everybody concerned, including the diocesan inspector. The vicar found the schoolmaster teaching that there were two sacraments, and, listening to this, said, "This won't do; you may take it there are seven sacraments." The schoolmaster replied, "I am very sorry, but I understand the Church Prayer-book only mentions two, and I have a conscientious objection to teaching seven." The vicar was apparently very much exasperated. This type of vicar is very rare, I admit;

I have not met the type myself, and I have been very closely in touch with elementary education for twenty or thirty years. But here we have a specimen of what this sort of man will do. In this village there is a custom for the teachers to make a May garland and the children to make a procession around the village. Mr. Clowes, the headmaster, who was also superintendent of the Sunday school, without any previous discussion on the part of the vicar, received the following letter—

> "Third Sunday after Easter,
> Billesden Vicarage, Leicester.
>
> DEAR MR. CLOWES.—We think it would be a good plan to have the Maypole this year exclusively for children of the Church. Of course, there may be other Maypoles; but as the origin of Maypoles is of a Christian character the children of the Church should have a Maypole of their own. Please give notice in Sunday school to-day that the children of Sunday School and Church will have a special garland of their own this year and that they should go round this week to collect flowers, &c. Yours sincerely,
>
> CHAS. R. FOWKE.

I may say, with reference to the statement that the origin of M ypoles is of a Christian character, that it rather nonplussed me, and I spent a lot of time in looking up encyclopædias and dictionaries to discover that origin, but in vain; perhaps one of my hon. friends will be able to invent a special brand of Maypole for Nonconformist children. But to return to the letter. The schoolmaster most respectfully but firmly declined to give out any such notice in the Sunday school, and here I may interpolate a remark on the question of appeal as provided for in the Bill. There is but a narrow margin, after all, between points of secular and religious instruction, and it would be interesting to know whether an appeal against the consequence of this schoolmaster's refusal to comply with the direction of the vicar came under the head of secular or religious. Mr. Fowke expressed the opinion that this master should thereafter resign the superintendence of the Sunday school or give out this notice, and the master accordingly sent in his resignation. This vicar wrote—

> "I got your letter last night on my return. . . . I also received your resignation of superintendent of the Sunday-school. I, however, expressed no wish that you should resign. What I said was that you were bound to give out notices in the Sunday-school which I gave you, or to resign."

This master, having resigned the superintendence of the Sunday school, was then called upon to resign his position as a day school teacher, but I am glad to say that such was the feeling of indignation aroused in the village that that notice of resignation was withdrawn. Nine-tenths of the people made an appeal to the vicar that Mr. Clowes should be allowed to continue giving religious instruction. And this is where the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment comes in. The vicar says: "Oh, no! under the trust deed I am the arbitrator in the matter, and to give religious instruction without my consent would create a schism in the village." It is in cases like this where the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment would be more effective. The position is broadly this, that in this village, where up to the present everything has been continued peacefully, you get day by day one section of the children called together to receive religious instruction of a particular sort at the hands of the vicar, and the great mass who do not desire to receive that kind of instruction getting none at all. I admit such a case is exceedingly rare, but it is such a case that the Kenyon-Slaney Clause would be able to meet, and it is because of occasional cases of this kind that I welcome that Clause, which would associate with a foolish incumbent of this kind, five laymen who would be able to regard the subject from a sane point of view.

There is only one part of this Bill that I view with apprehension, and that is the part which deals with the provision of new schools. The three Clauses dealing with the provision of new schools were never properly discussed in Committee; they were rushed through in two sittings, with seven applications of the Closure, although they depart entirely and fundamentally from the Accommodation Clause of the Act of 1870. These three Clauses are a fatally ingenious scheme for fastening denominationalism upon national education in this country, and in ten years time I think that those who are watching the operation of this Bill, and the effect that it will have on the education of the country, will look back on those three Clauses as the most vicious part of this Bill. What are they? Supposing that a village wants a school—I daresay they would prefer a public undenominational school; if they insist or the local authority insists on their behalf upon having one, first of all they have to pay the general rate levied upon the whole county, which the hon. and learned Attorney General put at a maximum of 3d.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I did not say anything of the kind. I said I should be very glad if one could think it would not be necessary to raise more than 3d.

DR. MACNAMARA: I will not enter into any wire-drawing dialectics with the hon. and learned Gentleman. I certainly understood him to suggest that that would be the maximum.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: There is no question of wire-drawing dialectics at all. I merely said I should be very glad if it were so.

DR. MACNAMARA: I thought I was fairly representing the hon. and learned Gentleman. But, however, the village that wants a national school has first to pay the county rate of 3d. or 6d., and then if they insist upon an undenominational school, out of their restricted and poverty-stricken rateable value they have to find half, at least, or three-quarters, of the entire capital sum for the erection of the school, which means that they will have to rate themselves to the extent of anything between 3d. and 30 pence for fifteen years. In the meantime you have the countervailing suggestion of the Church. The Church will come forward and say, "Why should you pay this charge? There is no necessity for your doing so; here is a building, which it may be is already in existence; or it may be, "We have a building fund, out of which we will build you a school free of charge, so that you will have nothing to pay but the county rate." Of course the people will accept the denominational school. They will swallow the Church Catechism to save the rate. I predict that under this Bill, when it becomes an Act, rarely if ever will a national school be set up in an outside area. Outside the great county boroughs and great urban centres generally, a new provided school will rarely be set up. I may be asked, how is the Church to find the money for a central fund for the erection of non-provided schools? The voluntary contributions amount at present to £650,000. They will fall off, very naturally, when the universal school rate is established. But supposing they only fall off slightly, what will the Church do with the money? Under the original terms of the Bill the Church would have been compelled to use it for the repair of the school fabrics, but since the Bill was altered by Closure in compartments the Church of England gets half the school fees, £60,000, half the endowments, another £60,000, and half the rentals, £30,000.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: None of those provisions were altered by the Closure.

DR. MACNAMARA: The provisions as to endowments and fees to be provided never arose until after the application of Closure by compartments.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: They were all discussed in debate.

DR. MACNAMARA: Only after we had been given the time-table. However, half the fees would represent £60,000, half the endowments £60,000, and half the rents of the teachers' houses —though I am told it is the whole— £30,000, making £150,000 in all. That is exactly the sum mentioned by the Bishop of London as being necessary to keep up the repairs of Church of England school buildings.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): That is an incorrect statement of what the Bishop said.

DR. MACNAMARA: Then I will withdraw the remark and put the matter in another way. I have gone carefully into the question, and, judging from a Return which shows the amount spent on repairs in all elementary schools—although it is mixed up with other items—I should be well within the mark if I say that the Church of England has never spent upon repairs more than 2s. a head on the 3,000,000 children in Church schools. That comes to £300,000. Towards that you have £150,000 from public sources in the shape of rent, fees, and endowments —that is, half the amount which, according to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University, was to be paid by the owners.

*Mr. TALBOT: The owners do not receive fees, and the great bulk of Church schools have no fees whatever.

Dr. MACNAMARA: The total amount of school fees in Church schools is about £120,000; and if the Church is prepared to pool a large sum for building purposes, she ought to be prepared to pool a large sum for repairs. The simple fact is, that after deducting the balance of £150,000 for repairs from the voluntary contributions of £650,000, you have half a million of money still at the disposal of the Church with which to set up a great building fund. But I am not sure that the matter will rest where it is. According to *The Times*, Dr. Temple said yesterday at Canterbury that—

> "He thought this Bill drove a hard bargain with the Church in some respects."

I should like to know what he calls an easy bargain. I should put it the other way and call it a hard bargain with the public. But he goes on to say—

> "In regard to repairs of buildings, he had thought that they would be allowed, at any rate, to leave upon the rates the repairs which were commonly included in the title of maintenance, those occurring from day to day, but that had been distinctly refused."

Then comes this significant and ominous sentence—

> "It would be rather a difficult thing to carry any Amendment in the House of Lords, but, nevertheless, they were bound to try."

All that I can say is that I hope his effort will be a very successful failure, because I think the bargain was a very fair one, and if anybody is hit it is the overburdened ratepayer. The Archbishop, in conclusion, said that—

> "He had summoned a meeting of all the Bishops for Friday next to discuss the details of the Bill, and he trusted that they might then determine in what way it would be their duty to deal with the Bill when it came into Committee next week."

It would be a gross impertinence on my part to offer any advice to Dr. Temple and his colleagues on the Episcopal Bench, but if I did venture to give any advice, it would be that they had better be content with what they have; they have done very well out of the matter. If they endeavour to make any more extortions—I can call them nothing else —they will reach the last straw and break the patient ratepayer's back.

I apologise for having kept the House so long. I have one final word. I frankly hope that this Bill, certain parts of which I have criticised, will work better in the localities than I fear will be the case. I sincerely hope that the result of the Bill will exceed the expectations of its most enlightened supporters. But this Bill is not the last word on the education question by a long way. I think the last word will be spoken by the people of this country in a much shorter time than the present Ministry imagine. The last word will not be spoken until every public school is under full and complete public control; as far as I am concerned, it will not be spoken until we place before every child in the realm, no matter how humble his extraction, such educational facilities as will enable him wisely and properly to steward the great national heritage which in due course will be handed over to his keeping.

*(3.22.) Sir RICHARD JEBB (Cambridge University): Our protracted discussions in Committee have been devoted mainly to the details of the machinery, and to certain aspects of the denominational question. This Bill, however, embodies a great national reform, and before it leaves this House it seems well that some of us should attempt to state the broad effects of the Bill on the educational prospects of the country as we see them. That is what I shall endeavour to do from my own point of view. Before doing so, however, I desire to touch on one or two points in the interesting debate of yesterday.

The first is a reference in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Referring to the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, after enumerating the various educational agencies under the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "But still we have not yet exhausted the starry firmament. We discover, by its disturbing influence rather than by actual vision, another mighty element, as the old and watchful astronomer recognised the planet Neptune by its influence on other heavenly bodies before it came within the range of his telescope."

That unseen power was, of course, the Bishop. I venture to think there is one difference between the astronomical discovery made by the right hon. Gentleman and that of Neptune. The actual priority of discovery in the latter case was due to a young man afterwards famous as Professor Adams, but the planet was discovered almost simultaneously by the distinguished French astronomer, Leverrier. The glory of the new astronomical discovery, however, is not shared by the right hon. Gentleman with any competitor; it belongs exclusively to himself. How he calculates the deflecting influence of an invisible Bishop on the orbit of a County Councillor, I cannot pretend to say; but, so far as I have observed the movements of those terrestrial bodies, I have not seen that they are particularly attracted by the ecclesiastical planet. As one who voted against the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, I should like to say why I took that course. Under the Clause, the tenour of the trust deed must be observed. The words "the tenour of" indicate that a general observance of the provisions as to religious teaching would suffice. For instance, if the trust deed provides that the teaching shall be that of the Church of England and under the supervision of the clergyman, the general tenour of the deed is satisfied if the teaching in the school continues to be the teaching of the Church of England, and the provision as to the supervision of the clergyman will not interfere with the control of the six managers: that control will be absolute. I entirely sympathise with those who, like the hon. and gallant Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire, wish to control the vagaries of clergymen who are not loyal to the Church of England. For my part, I am a moderate Churchman; and I condemn as strongly as any man in this House the excesses of disloyal clergymen. But I believe that the number of these extreme men is very small; and the reason why I object to the Kenyon-Slaney Clause is that it seems to open the way to the exclusion even of a moderate clergyman, who has not offended against the principles of the Church, from having any say in the religious instruction given in the Church school in his own parish. Anybody familiar with village life knows how inconceivably small and petty are the jealousies which sometimes exist, and out of the six managers any four may now determine that the clergyman, however unobjectionable, should have nothing whatever to do with the religious teaching in the school. The secular control over the school is already absolutely under the local authority. While I regard this Clause as a provision which may be salutary in a very few cases, it is one which may also operate unjustly towards a number of clergymen who are not really open to censure of any kind, but who from some trivial local cause may find a majority of the managers against them. However, I will pass from that, simply saying that never since I entered the House have I given a vote under clearer convictions than was the case in regard to this Kenyon-Slaney Clause.

The other point to which I wish to refer before coming to the more general aspect of the Bill is contained in a statement made yesterday by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen. He said there is no evidence that members of the Church of England desire Church of England teaching for their children. He admits that Roman Catholics desire Roman Catholic teaching. The only evidence he gave us for this theory was that some Church of England parents sent their children to board schools. We have never denied that in some board schools the religious teaching is very good, only there is no security for it. Obviously that is no proof of the right hon. Gentleman's assertion. Look at the history of the last thirty-two years. Would the Church of England have done all it has done, and made all these sacrifices, if the members of the Church did not care for Church of England teaching?

I turn from these points, and come to the larger educational bearings of this Bill. Why is this Bill brought in? What was the state of national education to call for such a large measure of reform? The first cause was that elementary education was in an unsatisfactory state. This was so because some of the voluntary schools were leading a precarious existence, which might have been closed almost any time, and some of them were more or less inefficient, through poverty. That was a very serious defect in our elementary system. Then as to our secondary system: it was in a chaotic condition. The two main causes of this were the conflict and overlapping of the authorities for secondary education, and, secondly, the overlapping of schools. That is to say, many schools were not doing the work they were designed and fitted for, and were engaged in a competition with other schools. That was wasteful. The Leader of the Opposition observed yesterday that as our educational opportunties were so limited we should not be too fastidious about overlapping. But overlapping is a fatal impediment to general organisation. Until you have schools doing their proper work, you cannot have the system properly organised as a whole.

These are two great defects which call for a large measure like this. There is a third defect, and that is the want of proper linking between primary and secondary education. It had been decided by law that the School Boards could not apply their funds to any other purpose than the elementary education of children. In 1899 the Board of Education took a stepin the right direction, by providing that certain schools should be specially equipped and staffed for higher grade work, and that the higher elementary education should be organised, with a systematic curriculum. That was, I think, a reform of great importance, but something more was needed. With those three great defects in our existing educational system, what was the state of the public mind? Much has been said about the absence of a special mandate. I suppose it will be true to say that the public opinion of this country was coming to feel that the state of our education was a very grave national disadvantage, that it hampered us most seriously in industrial and commercial competition, and that it might even become an urgent national peril. If the existence of such a state of public feeling, constantly expressed, was not a mandate to a Government, I cannot imagine what stronger mandate they could want.

What are the general aims of this Bill? In a few words, what are the chief things that it proposes to do? First in regard to elementary education. This Bill makes it possible, for the first time, that every public elementary school shall be maintained in a state of satisfactory efficiency. It makes this possible by assigning funds to the local education committees for that purpose, and the Board of Education will have as one of its duties to see that the purpose for which the money has been provided is fulfilled. There at once you have an immense gain, by the establishment of a secure basis for our educational system.

Then, as to secondary education. In Clause 2 the local authority is charged to take a survey of the educational needs of its area and to supply or aid the supply of education other than elementary; and it has to take the advice of the Board of Education as to the needs of the area, and the best way of meeting them. Certain funds are assigned to it for that purpose. I attach great importance to the provision that the Board of Education shall be consulted. A few years ago that provision would not have been of so much moment; but as the Board of Education is now constituted, it has a separate department for secondary education. It has all the machinery and the power, and it will certainly have the desire, to afford the most intelligent and effective guidance to the local authorities in the performance of their duty, to see that there is an adequate and suitable supply of secondary education in each area.

Next, as to linking primary with secondary education. The co-ordination of education of every kind is expressly provided for in Clause 2 as one of the duties laid on the local education authority. How can such co-ordination be carried out? Largely, in the first place, by a judicious system of scholarships or bursaries, but also by the adjustment of the curriculum of schools of different kinds and grades.

And now as to the training of teachers. There is nothing of greater national importance at this moment than the training of teachers, and that object is now expressly named in Clause 2. The local authority can establish training colleges or aid institutions that already exist. The grievance of Nonconformists is met, or I hope very largely met, because it is now in the power of the local education authority to establish undenominational training colleges, or undenominational hostels in connection with denominational training colleges. I am one of those who have always recognised the grievance of Nonconformists in this matter, and I rejoice to think that this Bill will go far to redress it. I attach very great importance to this provision in the Bill, coming as it does at a time when steps are being taken to establish a register of teachers. By the Order in Council of March last a Teachers' Registration Council is established. The Consultative Committee of the Board of Education have already framed regulations for the formation of a register, and the existence of this register will, I hope, afford a new and powerful stimulus to the training of teachers for secondary education.

In Clause 18 there is a provision in regard to the education committee for the inclusion of experts. That I think is of very great value, because under the old system, even in School Board districts, it is well known that this element was not always adequately represented on the School Board. I welcome also the provision for the necessary inclusion of women in these education committees. It is hardly necessary to point out how indispensable their presence is.

The greatest defect of the old educational system of this country was that it entirely failed to make education a prominent concern and interest of local life in counties or towns, whether large or small. Even in School Board areas education did not occupy that place, because the School Board was distinct from the organ of local government. I welcome this Bill for this reason among others, because I feel that it will go far to make education one of the foremost interests and concerns of the locality, be it country or town. At some sacrifice of strict logic in regard to the one authority principle, the Bill gives local autonomy in a prudently elastic form. The local autonomy is made adaptable to varying circumstances; and the position in which the Board of Education is placed is, so far as I can judge, the right one.

Such central control as is given under this Bill to the Board of Education really depends upon two ideas. The first idea is that the Board of Education represents expert knowledge. The second is that the Board of Education will be competent to advise in the light of a wide and comprehensive survey, more comprehensive than any local authority could take. But when all has been said, it remains true that the working of this Bill will require the goodwill and loyal co-operation of all concerned. I am confident that that condition also will be fulfilled, and I believe that this Bill, instead of diminishing, as has been prophesied, will stimulate and increase the popular interest in education.

It is constantly said that nothing is so disastrous in our country with regard to education as the absence of popular interest. For my part, I believe that there is great exaggeration upon this question. In some rural areas apathy exists beyond doubt, but, on the other hand, if you take the artisans of great towns in the North you will find that, as a rule, they are extremely keen about education. It was my honour to hold an educational post in Scotland for several years, and I had some opportunity of observing the feeling of Scotland about education. It may be due to a difference of temperament, or to more favourable conditions, or to both causes, but there is no doubt that in Scotland the interest in education is diffused through all classes in a way to which there is nothing comparable in England. I attribute that partly to the fact that the Scottish Universities have been open to all classes of the people, and partly also to the Scottish system of elementary and secondary education. To what has the apathy in England, so far as it exists, been due? I think one can point to one or two causes which go far to explain the difference between England and Scotland in that respect. The first cause has been the want of variety in the curriculum of our elementary schools. Under the old system of earning grants for special subjects, the curriculum was sometimes ludicrously unsuited to the circumstances and needs of the children. Under the block grant recently introduced, elasticity has been given in respect of the curriculum of elementary schools; thus in a rural school it will now be possible to teach things which will really interest the children, and which will be of use to them in their country life. Another great cause of that apathy has, I think, been want of continuity; that is, the fact that after a certain age, say, from twelve to fifteen years, there was in many cases no upward educational path open to a child of promise. Such a path is opened by this Bill. I think that is one of the most important benefits it will confer on the community. When these two defects in our educational system—want of variety and want of continuity—have been redressed, and when the machinery of this Bill is in full operation, I believe that in many, I hope most, localities of England there will grow up a real and living interest in education; and I believe that under the influence of this feeling, and with the loyal co-operation of all who are concerned, this Bill will prove what its framers have intended it to be, a far-reaching and salutary measure of educational reform.

(3.46.) Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I am sure the House has listened with the greatest interest to the speech of one of the highest authorities upon the subject of education among Members of this Assembly. I listened with special interest to the theory of my hon. friend in reference to the apathy shown in this country towards the subject. That apathy, he said, did not exist in the great towns of the North of England, and it did not exist in Scotland. Yes, but what is the education given in the large northern towns and in Scotland? It is the education given under the direction of School Boards. Where is this apathy to be found? In the rural districts, and especially in the South of England, where education is given under the denominational system. That, I think, is a simpler account of the matter than that given by my hon. friend. But I will not venture to occupy the time of the House by going into a general review of what may be the operation of this Bill, being satisfied with the exposition given by my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to confine what I have to say tonight to one principal point, and that is to my mind the most important part of the whole, the question of popular control as it stands under the Bill.

Now, quite apart from all details, apart even from the religious difficulty and its controversies, stands the great principle we, at all events, shall always contend for, and which I believe is valued on the other side of the House, that in the disposal of large sums of public money there should be sufficient public control. I ask the House to consider what is the public control effected by this Bill. This Bill starts with a new educational authority, the councils in counties and boroughs, and it is claimed that as these are popularly-elected bodies, there is consequently popular control. Well, you start with these county and borough councils, and there is one feature in these discussions upon which I must observe, and that is that the subject has been argued throughout rather too much upon the position in boroughs. Now the real difficulty and the real necessity of education in this country lie in the rural districts, and what I have to say has more reference to these districts than to the towns. You start with your County Council. Now a County Council, as everybody will admit, is a body without extended experience of educational work at present. I do not say you cannot impose a new duty on County Councils, but this is an immense subject which quite overshadows the other duties they have to perform, and I think it is a great misfortune, as my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean said, that the electors of County Councils should not have had the opportunity of considering what sort of a council they would desire to deal with the subject of education. But that can only come later, and for the present you must take the Councils as they are after having been elected for the discharge of totally different duties and for dealing with matters of highways and other local subjects of infinitely less importance than education. This, however, as my right hon. friend says, is a battle that will have to be fought out in the future. Electors in due time will have to consider what should be the constitution of their County Council, and I believe it will be very different from what we have had up to the present time. Elections will be fought on very different grounds and will involve conflicts on religious and political issues to which they have hitherto been strangers. I will assume that County Councils have set to work. Now, they meet four times a year; it is hardly to be supposed that they will meet constantly, like School Boards. But you abolish School Boards and County Councils take their place. They meet four times a year, and of course they cannot settle even the policy, much less the details, of an educational system for the counties, and therefore they are to have an education committee. It is a very proper thing for a County Council to have such a committee, but up to this time a County Council has been thought capable of choosing and constituting their own committees. But we have changed all that. This Council is not to have the power of choosing its committee, and the consequences I will show as affecting the question of popular control. This committee, I suppose, for the County Council is forbidden to exercise its powers except on consultation with the committee, is to settle the educational policy. My hon. friend behind me stated that the majority of this committee must consist of elected members of the Council, but that is not so; there is a permissive power that it may not be so. If members of the County Council do not want a majority of their members to be on the committee, they may be in a minority, and, therefore, the popular element may be in a minority, and what is insisted upon is that, at all events, there shall be a large body of members of the committee not appointed by the Council; they are to represent other people and are to be nominated by other bodies.

What becomes, then, of your public control? Here is a Council, which is an elected body, which has introduced into its body persons whom they are bound to appoint because they have been nominated by other bodies. Who are these other bodies? My hon. friend who has just sat down talks of education experts, and no doubt County Councils would voluntarily call in education experts to assist them, but that is not the real point; the point is the persons they represent in the shaping of an education policy. There is no secret about it. Everybody knows that the representatives of denominational and sectarian bodies are to be placed on this committee whether the County Council likes it or not. My hon. friend the Secretary to the Education Department used very conciliatory language on the subject. Well, he is a conciliatory person, but this Bill is one that is to last, and power is given to the Education Department to revise the schemes of County Councils, whom you assume to be bodies fit to conduct this great business. In the preparation of a scheme, the Council is supposed to know all about the sort of education fitted for its district, and the scheme goes to the Education Department at Whitehall. The Department may revise the scheme and, if necessary, have a public inquiry to decide whether or not a County Council is a fitting body and has framed a fitting scheme and competent for its purpose. It is to hear claimants to go upon the committee of the County Council. The Department may not approve the scheme, and may return it to the Council. But suppose the Council differs from the Department, and declines to accept the advice of the Department, what is to happen then? Well, you start with a conflict between the County Council and the Department. My hon. friend who has just sat down says he approves of the control of the Education Department, which runs, as I shall directly show, through the whole of this Bill, and makes them masters everywhere of the County Council in every part of its operations. And you call that popular control! The education authority has not popular control; it may be expert control, but it is not popular control, and the great feature of this Bill is that in no place has the popularly-elected body real control of any part of the education of the country; it is a subordinate agent, and the setting up of a great independent education authority deriving its force from its knowledge of the conditions of the district is absolutely contrary to the whole texture of this Bill. Then we will suppose that in the revised scheme of the Education Department representatives of all the sects have been placed, under the powers of this Bill, upon the Committee of the County Council.

It has been stated here that that has been protested against, and we have endeavoured to mitigate even the terms under which the Councils were obliged to appoint upon nomination. I believe there were representations by a committee of the County Councils that they disliked, and naturally disliked, a position which was altogether inconsistent with their dignity and with their authority, and which they regarded as humiliating; but for some reason or other the Government retained these words, and would not even alter the word "nomination" of these outside bodies. Now, Sir, I say in the first place—to use the word which my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has used—you dilute your popularly-elected authority by pouring into it these nominations of outside bodies. That is the first invasion of the popular authority, because this important Committee is not a popularly-elected authority, nor is it nominated even by a popularly-elected body. I confess that this notion of holding a public inquiry, to allow these persons to come forward and claim to be put upon these Committees, not at the instance or even with the consent of the County Councils, is at once to introduce a conflict which will be extremely injurious to education. What is the position of the County Councils? If they do not accept the scheme returned to them by the Education Department, the Education Department in Whitehall supersedes the County Councils, and compels them to act under their orders. I say that is not popular control, nor even that of this education committee. I am trying to look at the thing as I imagine it will work in the rural districts with which I am acquainted. The County Council meets four times a year, and it has to do all the business of the county, which it does very well at present, and all the work of higher education and elementary education and technical education at those meetings. Of course it cannot do it. The work will have to be done by this committee. The committee will, I suppose, meet at the central town in the county, but how often it is to meet I do not know. The School Boards are constantly at work. I see there is a minimum of three months—that is to say, this committee is to meet four times a year also. And upon that is to depend the government of the education of the country. Therefore, it is not on the County Council, nor is it on this committee, that the real working of the education in the rural districts will depend. In the large towns it is different; the Councils are there, and the committees are there, and they can constantly attend to the work. But in the rural districts the whole thing depends, and must depend, on the managers, and the moment you come to the management you annihilate popular control; the whole object is to annihilate popular control. Six managers are to be appointed, and four of these are to be appointed under private trust deeds. That is the management which is to arrest education. The popular control of your great central authority is represented by one out of six. I say it is a farce to talk of popular control in the management of the schools in the rural districts. There is nothing of the kind. You have deliberately framed your plan for the purpose of excluding popular control. Who are these four managers? They are appointed under private trust deeds, and they are the statutory majority. What is the position, then, of the popularly-elected bodies in the practical management of education in these schools? They are permitted the privilege of appointing one man out of six in the management of all the denominational schools in the rural districts. To talk of popular control under such a system is a farce, a contradiction in terms altogether. You may say that, though the managers are appointed in this manner, they are to be under the direction and instruction, with regard to secular education, of the education authority. But there is a great difference between giving instructions to men whom you appoint yourself and giving instructions to men who are appointed by other people. But the instructions are to be given to men whom they have not appointed and whom they cannot dismiss, and the statutory majority are what you may call strangers altogether to the education authority, from whom they receive their instructions. That you start with.

I remember that when this Bill was launched we were told that the minority were to act the part of an Opposition; they were to criticise and to appeal to public opinion against anything they disapproved of in the action of the majority. It is that majority to whom the minority of one is to give the instruction in regard to secular education. What is the position in reference to the things in regard to which instruction is to be given? The managers may differ in the view of secular education taken by the County Council or their committee. My hon. friend who has just sat down stated that the great defect of elementary education in this country was want of variety. But this Bill has destroyed all variety in elementary education in this country. The Cockerton judgment is accepted as the Government's principle of elementary education. They actually confine the words "elementary education" to reading, writing, and arithmetic. Therefore, we may well understand that there will be differences of opinion—a more enlightened view on the part of the County Councils than on the part of the nominees of the trust deeds. But who prevails in that matter? These two authorities—that is to say, the managers and the County Council, who give the instructions—are treated in this Bill as co-equal authorities; one is not subject to the other. They may both of them appeal to the Education Department, and the Education Department may rule out the instructions of the County Council even upon secular education.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY dissented.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I know the Attorney General has given one interpretation on this matter, but it has not the force of a court of law. What he says is that they only determine whether the instructions have been carried out. I do not believe that is the force of the words at all. The words of the Clause are very distinct. They are:

> "If any question arises under this section between the local education authority and the managers of a school not provided by the authority, that question shall be determined by the Board of Education."

Therefore, on any question that arises between these two authorities the Board of Education may decide in favour either of one or the other equally. That is not popular control; it is the control of the Education Department, which is not a popular body. Therefore here, again, as everywhere, the authority of the County Council is superseded by the authority of the Education Department, and the popular element is overwhelmed by Downing Street. You raise in these autonomous bodies exactly the same feeling that has been raised in your self-governing colonies by the interference of the experts of Downing Street. They did not tolerate it, and you will not find it tolerated here. The County Councils have proved themselves able and competent to do their own business; and to be told that on every question that arises between them and the managers, the managers will appeal against their instructions to the Education Department, is a source of friction, in my opinion, that will be absolutely injurious to the working of your educational system. As to secular education, then, the Education Department is the last resort and the final authority to determine it, and not the popularly elected authority. This latter is not the authority in this matter of secular education. All the representations, therefore, which have been made upon this subject, that the local education authority would be supreme in secular education, are entirely inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill.

Take another subject, one of much less importance—the maintenance of buildings. I refer with regret to this sordid subject, which has been dealt with in such a huckstering spirit. What has been the situation with regard to this question? We have been told that this great contribution towards the maintenance of the buildings was a consideration to support the monopoly to be granted to the voluntary schools. We are told that there was to be a great sacrifice on their part. What sacrifice is there? By dint of mere clamour on their part during the debates on the Bill, they have been able to appropriate funds which have been intended for the general education of the children, for the relief of their liabilities—for the relief of those subscriptions which they were to make in order to keep up those buildings. They have succeeded in appropriating endowments, they have succeeded in appropriating the fees and the grants from the Exchequer; and in that manner, as my right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen has shown, they have got rid altogether of this liability, and, I believe, pocketed a little nest egg for themselves. And so disappears the whole of the consideration for which they were supposed to claim the monopoly of these schools. Then, when a demand is made by the local authority for some repairs in a country school, these parties, who have shown this spirit, make an appeal to the Education Department in London to inquire and decide whether the repair in some country school ought to be made on the demand of the local education authorities; as if the authorities in Downing Street were better judges of such a matter than the local education authorities who were on the spot and knew what the state of the school was; so that the intellect and experience of my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education are to be called upon to decide the number of coats of paint ultimately to be given to the school building. I confess I do not at all like the idea of a man of his great educational experience being called upon to decide a question of that kind. That is what my hon. friend who has just spoken calls the expert authority of the Board of Education. I venture to think that there will be frequent applications, because if the managers think they can save half-a-crown, the matter will go to Downing Street, and the question will be decided by the Secretary to the Education Department. I confess that an arrangement of this kind seems to me to be one not calculated either to promote the educational interests of the district or the dignity of the Established Church of England.

Then, Sir, there has come into this Clause of the Bill, by a sort of miracle, the famous Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. The circumstances of that operation are very curious. It does not depend on popular control at all, of course. Popular consideration is to have nothing to say in the matter; it depends entirely on the foundation managers, and the question is whether one of the foundation managers, that is to say, the parson, is to control education, or whether it is to be the managers generally. But, really, the one means the four foundation managers. Well, this Kenyon-Slaney Amendment seems to puzzle the universal intellect of the House. No two persons seem to have the same opinion about it. We have had successive explanations of the Clause from the Attorney General, but each explanation makes the matter less intelligible than it was before. Whether it is that the trust deed should invest the parson with the sole authority in religious teaching, or whether it is that the sole control shall be in the hands of the managers, we are just as much at a loss to know as when the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was first introduced into the House. It is a remarkable thing that the Government have said that that was always their policy. Well, if it is so, it is curious that they did not put a Clause in their Bill which would have explained their meaning. It is still more curious that, after this Clause was put in, they have not made it clear to the ordinary intellect what the meaning of that Clause is. Now it is going to be sent up to another place, in order that another place may explain what nobody here understands. It will have, no doubt, some exposition in another place, and it will not be left, as the Clause now stands, to be determined by the Education Department in Downing Street. However, we may feel sure that, like a ghost, before many days expire, the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment will haunt us again here in some form or other. Whether it will be intelligible then or not, whether it will then be satisfactory or not to the adopting parents who sit on the front Bench, I really do not know. I must, I fear, leave that for further explanation.

With reference to this question of popular control, I will only further allude to the Clause which deals with new schools. It is a most extraordinary thing. If there be anything which the local education authority ought to be a judge of and capable of judging, it is whether there should be a new school in a district of its area. If it is not fit to judge of such a matter as that, it is not fit to judge of anything at all in regard to education. It is absolutely excluded from judging that question, because the Education Department are to be the sole judges whether there is to be a new school or not. If the Education Department thinks that there ought to be a new school in the district, what happens? Why, the Education Department summons a meeting to inquire whether the local education authority is a fit judge of such things. They invite the people to come, and any ten ratepayers can come forward and say, "The County Council knows nothing at all about this. We pray that you shall not allow them to erect a new school; our school is the best, and if there is to be a new school it is not to be their school; it is a school which we are prepared to put up." What a predicament to put the County Council in! They are to be challenged by outsiders, and their views are to be set at naught—the views of the education authority. What becomes, then, of popular control with regard to new schools, and that the authority are to decide this question amongst other things? I call special attention to this enactment in this Clause, because it is the greatest indignity and disability inflicted upon the local authorities that it is possible to conceive. It is not, seemingly, the wishes of the parents or the opinions of the authorities on the spot that are to be considered. Then, as to "the economy of the rates," is it the Education Department in London or the County Council which is to determine the disposal of the rates? A thing like that will not be tolerated, and ought not to be tolerated. Yet it is seriously proposed that a matter of this kind shall be taken out of the hands of the Council and put into the hands of the Education Department in Downing Street. Do you call that decentralisation? Why, a more centralising Bill was never introduced into this House. It centralises everything and every point, and it makes the Education Department in Downing Street masters of the County Council at every step and in every department of their work. Therefore, to say that this is not a centralising Bill is futile; it is contrary to every Clause of the Measure. And the opinions of the County Councils with regard to it have been declared. I have already referred to the County Councils Association. It is my belief that they regard the manner in which they are dealt with, with, if not indignation, resentment. They are treated as if they were children. They are treated as people who are incapable and incompetent to carry on their work if they are not under the tutelage and under the rod of the Education Department in every step that they have to take. The Council of the county which I have the honour to represent, have passed a resolution against this Bill by a majority of twenty-nine to sixteen. This body respectfully informed the Government that if the Bill "passed in its present shape this Council cannot be responsible for its administration." I do not wonder at any County Council taking such a view of a duty cast upon them when they are treated throughout as if they are not fit to discharge the office which they are called upon to undertake. That is what I have to say upon the subject of popular control.

Sir, there are many other features of this Bill to which we have great objection, but this is a question which seriously affects the authority to which you are going to transfer the education of the country. In my opinion you are showing an absolute distrust of the popular authority, and making it incapable of discharging the duties that you put upon it. I will not detain the House much longer. I regard this as a bad Education Bill. In higher education it supplies resources which are utterly inadequate. They may be made adequate possibly in some of the great towns. As far as the country is concerned, you will have made no adequate provision, even with the alteration of Clause 23, for enabling those in the elementary schools to get access to higher education. The establishments for higher education in the rural districts will be few and far between, and the children from the elementary schools, whom you have practically excluded by your Bill from higher education, by following the principle of the Cockerton judgment, will not get to the higher educational establishments. The amount of money you have enabled the County Councils to dispose of will not be sufficient for the establishment of extensive buildings and staff, for the training of teachers, and for all the duties which are cast upon these bodies in spite of the Amendments made in Section 23. Complaints have been made of the length of the discussions upon the Bill. The length of those discussions is due to the incomplete and imperfect manner in which the Bill was introduced. If you look at the Bill as it is now and as it was when it was introduced, you will see that the main part—that a great part, at all events—of the Bill had not been thought out or worked out by the Government when it was introduced. It cannot be denied that a great part of the people of this country are not favourable to your Bill. It was a little amusing to hear my hon. friend the Member for Stretford the other day say that the Bill was popular in the North of England. He was at once confronted by my hon. and learned friend the recently-elected Member for Cleveland, which, according to my geographical knowledge, is in the North of England. As far as we are able to test this matter by recent popular elections, whether in the municipalities or electoral Parliamentary districts, the verdict has been unfavourable to the Bill. This Bill will go forth to the country—I regret it deeply—as a signal not of peace but of conflict. There is nobody on the other side of the House who will deny that proposition. The Bill destroys all that organisation which has been most successful in education, and its whole object is to promote that system which has been the least successful. It diminishes public control over education as it exists in the School Boards. A Bill which has those characteristics in my opinion cannot and will not settle the question of national education. There remains nothing in my opinion for those who desire to see a real and sound system of national education established except hereafter to struggle eagerly and persistently to establish a real popular control over the education of the country and to remove the influence of sectarian dogmas from the education of the people.

(4.40.) Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I think that what must have struck every man who has been in the House at the close of this protracted debate is the deep repose that has fallen upon the House now that the last stage of the Bill has been entered upon. It has had, perhaps, a stormy youth, but its old age, so far as its career through the House is concerned, seems to be perfectly peaceful. [A Voice: "Gag."] The House debated all Tuesday, and will be debating all this evening, whether the Bill should be read a third time, and some people may say the debates have been a little dull. If there were the intense feeling which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth has spoken of, it would surely have found some manifestation on the Benches opposite. But I can see little sign in the House of what the right hon. Gentleman seems to expect—that the Bill will go to the country as a message, not of peace, but of war. One hon. Gentleman opposite produced what he said was a carefully-prepared diagram. He held it up, however, at such a distance as only to tantalise us, and he explained that it showed in great detail the rights of popular control and the rights of clericalism, and a number of other things with which I need not trouble the House; but this is not a time for diagrams or the discussion of details. We are upon the Third Reading of a great measure of national importance. The question is whether we are going to give up the problem of English education as insoluble. No one can at present defend the existing state of things in this country with regard to education; but the difficulties of the situation are very largely due to the fact that when the State was absolutely neglecting its duty of popular education, the Church stepped in and covered the ground with schools. She was for some time the only machinery for giving the education which we now recognise it is the duty of the Government to supply. When the ground has been covered in that way we cannot proceed in quite so symmetrical a manner as if we were starting a system for the first time. A learned man once said of the English alphabet that it was defective, redundant, erroneous and inconsistent. All these things could be said, I think with perfect truth, of the educational system of England at the present time. What are we going to do? Some remedy must be applied. Everybody is agreed as to that, but no one has any remedy to suggest except the Bill which is now before the House. Hon. Members who object to the Bill, say with perfect truth that it is not for them at present to prepare an alternative measure, but they might indicate broadly what competing scheme is in the field. Yesterday the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen revealed the fact, of which I myself was aware, that he had a competing scheme; but he said that he had been prevented on two occasions by the Closure from bringing it forward, and that on the Third Reading of the Bill it was too late to discuss its merits.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The Attorney General seems to me to be labouring under a defect which has been ascribed to my countrymen in not understanding that I was making what was perhaps rather a mild joke.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: On the contrary, I think the joke a very good one, because I believe the right hon. Gentleman has not any scheme at all.

Mr. BRYCE: Of course I have a scheme. We have all got schemes.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Why does not the right hon. Gentleman expose his scheme to the blasts of criticism?

Mr. BRYCE: Because I know you would not take it.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Why does not the right hon. Gentleman tell us there is a better way of dealing with this matter? Why does he lock it up in his own breast? He seems to have treated his scheme like Don Quixote treated his second helmet when, without exposing it to further rude experiments, he pronounced it to be an excellent helmet indeed. To reject this measure is really a counsel of despair, and equivalent to saying, "We may as well give up the problem of English education altogether." From time to time a plaintive cry is raised during these debates for the Scottish system. The Scottish system as it exists at the present moment has very many and very great merits; it has not the merit which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire ascribed to it. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the interest of the Scotch in, and their passion for, education had all been created by School Boards. I need hardly tell anyone acquainted with Scotland that that passion and interest existed long before School Boards were heard of, and would continue to exist if School Boards should ever disappear. Under any system or conditions, I believe the people of Scotland would insist on having good education for their children.

The Scotch system is one which whenever it has come under discussion has produced confusion on the other side of the House. If it were proposed to give the Scotch system, the question would at once arise: Are you prepared to take that which is a vital feature of the Scotch system, viz., the complete control of the local education authority over the religious education in the schools? Whenever the question has been raised some hon. Members have replied in the affirmative, but the great majority in the negative. ["No."] Well, a great many have. Will anybody say that the Nonconformists are prepared to abandon the Cowper-Temple Clause? It is perfectly notorious that that Clause is regarded by the great majority of English Nonconformists as the very ark of the covenant, and any man who dared to lay his hand upon it would incur their extremest wrath. We have had said to us: "Give us the Scotch system, and abolish the Cowper-Temple Clause."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Hear, hear!

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: If I understand the interruption of the hon. Member, that is what he wants. It might suit Wales, but would it suit England? I venture to say that, with the views entertained by English Nonconformists, to abolish the Cowper-Temple Clause would be to throw your whole system of local government into confusion. There is the keenest feeling on the subject. I think it an unreasonable feeling, because, naturally, I am in favour of the Scotch system and the complete freedom given by that system to the local education authority. But one must recognise facts. It is no use trying to legislate regardless of the conditions by which the problem is complicated. I venture to think that the Government would have made a huge mistake, for which hon. Members opposite would have been prompt to punish them, if they had brought forward a proposal involving the adoption of the Scotch system and the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause. The problem with which the Government had to deal is not an easy one, owing to the fact that our system of education is so complex, being largely the result of voluntary effort, while, at the same time the State has stepped in and set up, side by side with the voluntary schools, board schools. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen talked contemptuously of the consideration that the Church schools were there and had to be reckoned with; he dismissed it as the "bricks-and-mortar" argument. But these Church schools are just as much the property of the trustees as the house of the right hon. Gentleman is his property.

Mr. BRYCE: No; they are held under trusts.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: It is perfectly true that they are held under trusts; but that trust only embodies the desire, to which legal effect has been given, of those who supplied the money with which the school was built. Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that the trustees have a legal property in the assets available for the purposes of the trust? Does he deny that they are bound to apply the property to those purposes? Does he propose that wherever property is held under a public trust the State may step in, irrespective of any change of circumstances, and confiscate that property, applying it to other purposes merely on the terms of making what they consider to be adequate compensation to the owners?

MR. BRYCE: I deny that there is any confiscation of property implied, and I say that there have been many cases in which changes far more sweeping than any we have proposed with regard to these trusts have been made, and wisely made, by the Legislature.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No one will deny that where circumstances have widely changed trusts of a public and charitable nature may properly be varied by the State. But the practical proposal of the right hon. Gentleman, as explained last night, is that the State should step in and say: "We are going to take these schools, paying you a rent for them, and apply them to such educational purposes as we think proper, not being those for which the schools were founded."

MR. BRYCE: If the hon. and learned Member wishes to know the nature of my proposal, he will find it in the discussions of about a week ago.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I think I have accurately represented it.

MR. BRYCE: Not quite.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Well, very nearly. The proposal was to take the schools, pay a rent, and use them for purposes other than those for which they were established.

MR. BRYCE: Not altogether.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I think I have stated with sufficient accuracy the nature of the proposal. I venture to say that to expropriate all these schools, even though rents were paid, would be doing violence to those principles on which the courts of law and the Legislature of this country have been in the habit of acting. It is no use saying you will pay a rent. The owners of the institutions desire them to be applied to the purposes for which they were established. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire was very severe on the Church with reference to what he called the bargain she had driven as to the duties to be discharged by the present owners of the schools, the repairs, the sums to be received in respect of endowments and fees, and so forth. I have had occasion to look into this matter, and if the right hon. Gentleman went into it carefully he would find that the imposition upon the managers of the duty of executing the repairs will bear very hardly on a great many Church schools. That duty has been imposed because it seemed to the Government to be consistent with the scheme of the Bill, and best divided the matter as between the managers and the local education authority. It will impose considerable sacrifices on those interested in many of these schools, and I believe those sacrifices will be met by a system of combination throughout the country dioceses. To say that the Bill has given to the Church a great deal more than she was entitled to is a statement which no one could make if they had looked into the details.

Then the right hon. Gentleman said it was a ridiculous thing that the Board of Education should be called in to decide whether a new school should be a provided or a non-provided school. I think it is a most reasonable provision that—after the local inquiry, after eliciting the opinion of the neighbourhood, and taking all the circumstances into consideration—the Board should be able to arbitrate in the interests of all concerned. The right hon. Gentleman made another statement which seemed to be calculated almost to incite the local authorities to rise in rebellion against such a proposal.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Some of them have.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I venture to say that all those who are familiar with the extent to which local government is supervised and controlled through the machinery of local inquiries agree that it would be hopeless to attempt to get the local education authorities to engage in any such crusade as that which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to advocate.

We do not say that this Bill is an ideal solution of all the difficulties of the case. The problem is a very difficult and complicated one, and what we do say is that the Bill is the only practicable solution, having regard to the materials with which the Government have had to work. We have had to deal with two forces—the element of denominational control and the element of popular control. I believe that under the provisions of the Bill those two forces will work together, "not by collision, but by pressure." There will not be a series of sharp collisions between the denominational interest and the local education authority as some seem to anticipate; but the two forces will work together, the one pressing on the other, without friction or trouble, with a result which will express a system of national education, doing no violence to the religious convictions of any large section of the people.

In regard to the question of popular control, to which the greater part of his speech was devoted, the right hon. Gentleman said that the County or Borough Councils would not really be supreme, because they would have education committees.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said they could appoint their own committee

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The right hon. Gentleman went further. I understood him to say that the Council could only act on the advice of the education committee.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No, no!

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I am sorry if I misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. What is the fact is that the education committee must be consulted, and before acting the Council ought to have heard the advice of the education committee, but that is subject to this question, that if the Council regard it as a case of emergency they need not wait for the report of the education committee. As regards the powers of the education committee, they are only such as the Council think fit to delegate to them. The right hon. Gentleman did say that the intrusion into the committee of outside elements was somewhat derogatory to the position of the local education authority. I do not share that view. I believe that the local education authority will welcome the presence on the education committee of those who have special knowledge of the circumstances of the schools in the district or have special knowledge in education matters.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Why not leave it to the Councils?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: We are preparing a scheme for the whole country, and we have thought it right in that scheme to lay down those conditions which seem to make more for the harmonious working of the plan, and I venture to think that it is no use to say "Why not leave it to the Councils?" if the scheme is the best scheme for achieving a successful result. The right hon. Gentleman has criticised the power of appointment of the County Councils in regard to those nominated to serve on those bodies. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman's statement was quite accurate, but I will not weary the House by referring to the admirable and clear statement made on this point by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire proceeded to deal with the question of the control of the local education authority over secular education, and he said that it was not a real and effective control. On this point I should like to quote what was said on the 7th of November by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen. He said:—

> "They had subjected denominational schools to the control of the local authority for all purposes of secular instruction. Therefore, so far as secular instruction was concerned the denominational schools were on a level with other schools."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But an appeal is given to the Education Department.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I am pointing out that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen stated, and correctly stated, that as regards the control of secular education the denominational schools were on the same footing as the board schools. The whole fallacy of the right hon. Gentleman's argument on this point is that he very much exaggerates the functions and office of the managers as against the local education authorities. Every one knows who has read the Bill that the managers are bound to obey the instructions of the local education authority in every matter relating to secular instruction, and if they do not obey those instructions the local education authority may step in and themselves see that their instructions are carried out.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But if there is a difference between them it must go to the Education Department, to whom the final appeal is given.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No, no!

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It says so in the Bill.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I will deal with that point in a moment. The fact that the local education authority have the power of so stepping in will prevent any friction arising. If there had been no remedy at the command of the local education authority it is conceivable that a wrong-headed board of managers might set themselves up against the local education authority, but as soon as they realise that the local education authority can step in and themselves do the act they know that resistance is futile and the apprehended collision will never take place. It will be another case in which the bodies established under this Bill will achieve the desired result, not by a collision but by pressure. The right hon. Gentleman said that what he had in his mind was the appeal to the Board of Education which was given in a case of difference between the managers and the local education authorities. The right hon. Gentleman is really under a complete mistake, as he will find if he will look at the terms of Clause 7, which provide that—

> "The managers of the schools shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given."

There follows later in the Clause a section which provides that any question arising between the managers and the local education authority shall be determined by the Board of Education.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That overrules the former provision.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I really do not think that this point has been contested seriously by anybody except the right hon. Gentleman opposite since it was explained. This point has been explained over and over again. The Clause says—

> "The managers of the school shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: They may appeal against it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No, they cannot; the Board of Education must accept the law as it is declared by statute, and if the statute says in terms that any direction given by the local education authority is to be carried out by the managers, the managers must carry it out.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): The only question arising is as to whether they have carried out the directions or not.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: That is another matter. If the question is as to whether the direction has been carried out, then the Board of Education might have to decide. but it would be a very barren field, because the local education authority might give another direction and might insist on that being carried out.

The right hon. Gentleman has also touched on the question of religious education, and, of course, no one can do so without naming that Clause which will render my hon. and gallant friend the

Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire immortal. On more than one occasion I have stated my view of the effect of that Clause. If the trust deeds provide for the reference to a bishop on the question of what is appropriate religious teaching, having regard to the tenets of the denomination, that reference will not be interfered with; but, as regards the whole management and control of the giving of that religious instruction, how and by whom it is to be given, the effective power of decision rests without appeal with the managers. My right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University seems to express some apprehensions as to how this Clause may work. I do not share those apprehensions; I believe that the people are perfectly ready and willing to welcome the guidance of the clergy, and that it is only in very rare cases, where the clergman is very extreme or wrong-headed—for there are such cases in all professions—that there will be any danger of collision. In such cases, the managers, of course, within the terms of the trust deed as to the nature of the religious instruction, must have the last word. The right hon. Gentleman says that different views are entertained with regard to the meaning of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, but I would remind the House that no Amendment was moved to the Clause in Committee, or, at all events, was not pressed.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): On the contrary, I moved Amendments which were much more intelligible than the Clause.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: They were not pressed.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Not to a division, but they were put from the Chair and negatived.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: On the whole, the action of my noble friend was very platonic when the Amendment was before the House. The Amendments were not pressed.

LORD HUGH CECIL: They were negatived without a division.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: That is what is generally spoken of as not being pressed. I agree that our debates since have shown very considerable difference of opinion as to the meaning and effect of this Clause. The fact that such a difference of opinion exists, in my view renders it eminently desirable that when this Clause is discussed in another place such alterations shall be made as will put its meaning beyond all dispute. We know that others may think differently, but it is not as if the difference of opinion on the meaning of this Clause was to be measured by the side of the House on which hon. Gentlemen sit. It is not that the Government takes one view of the meaning of this Clause and that hon. Members on this side of the House agree with them, while hon. Members on the other side take a different view. The differences on this Clause are not coincident with the division of politics. If they were some such suggestion might be made as was thrown out in the remarks of my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury the other night as to the division of opinion on subjects of this kind when they are raised in this House. I have always maintained that my right hon. friend would have been a great lawyer—a very great lawyer. The differences of opinion with regard to this Clause are not coincident with the differences of political opinion in the House, and I am bound to say this, that I have been very much struck in the somewhat protracted and very keen debates on this Bill with the fairness of the hon. and learned Gentlemen on the other side of the House. Time after time it has, of course, been my duty to the best of my ability to state my views as to the construction of particular portions of the Bill. Debate has often arisen on the question whether that was the true interpretation or not. On several occasions hon. and learned Gentlemen on the other side of the House, dealing with matters as to questions of law, have interposed and expressed their concurrence in the view I have ventured to express as being the true meaning of the Clause, and have in this way avoided the partisanship of the mere politician. I think it only fair that I should acknowledge in this matter what I may call the intellectual honesty of the members of my profession on the other side of the House. It is what everyone would have expected who knows the profession, and, therefore, I think it is not unsuitable that I should express the sense I myself entertain.

On this side of the House — and this is what I wish to direct attention to—there has been considerable divergence of opinion as to the meaning of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, and it is for that reason that I, speaking for myself, think it most desirable that when this measure goes to another place this controversy should be finally settled, and settled in two directions. In the first place, I think I have seen symptoms in some of the speeches of my noble friend the Member for Greenwich of a disposition to contend that the wording of the earlier part of the Clause is somewhat ambiguous, and that the provision that the religious instruction should be given in accordance with the trust deed would really incorporate all the provisions of the trust deed as to the superintendence of the clergy apart from the right of control of the managers. I think it is perfectly clear that construction is impossible. In the second place, I entertain a strong personal opinion that if a trust deed has provided for the decision of a question of what is the religious teaching of the denomination by some ecclesiastical authority, it is much more proper and decorous that it should be decided by that authority than that it should be wrangled over by the managers themselves, with the vision of a revision by a court of law in the background. I certainly should welcome any addition to the Clause which will put it beyond the reach of controversy that the construction of the Clause is what I have already said it must be, if you take it as a whole —namely, that the power of decision by a suitable authority is not interfered with by the control given to the managers. We have been told by my noble friend who interrupted me just now that it would be perfectly amazing to make any distinction in this matter between doctrine and machinery. I can assure my noble friend that by his remarks on that subject he has made a great deal more of it than I have done. It is unfortunately true that in the history of the Church questions of government, of rites and ceremonies, of procedure, and of machinery have absorbed an amount of attention which might more worthily have been devoted to the weightier matters of the law; but to import matters of that sort as to Church government and as to proper procedure in giving religious instruction in a school is to me an astounding statement. If I may venture to say so to my noble friend, it shows an amount of confusion which is possible only in one who for the moment has lost himself in the mist of ecclesiastical controversy. Where are such pretensions to stop? Is it to be said that no mother is to be allowed to teach her children religion unless she is under the immediate superintendence of a clergyman? Is she to take out a licence for that purpose? I shall not enlarge on that subject, but it is rather a striking thing that claims of this kind should ever have been seriously advanced by the great Protestant Church of England.

LORD HUGH CECIL: My hon. and learned friend must not suppose that I admit that he understands my point, or that he has correctly represented it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I dare say my hon. friend shrinks from the conclusion.

LORD HUGH CECIL: No; I shrink from the incapacity of the legal mind to understand the matter.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I infer that my noble friend shares with the lay mind the propensity, when it is convicted of inaccuracy, to ride off on the plea that it is a legal quibble. This Bill will soon pass into law. It will pass from the debates of this House, and we believe that it will go out into the country and will have the effect of securing that for every English child there shall be available the best education that can be given by this country. I do not very much like some of that educational slang with which we have become familiar in the House lately. We have been told over and over again that this Bill establishes the "ladder" system. One would suppose that it establishes some new system of gymnastic exercise. What this Bill does is that it secures a career open to talent; it secures good education for every child born in the country. Everyone recognises that ability occurs as frequently among the children of the poor as among the children of those who are better off. The object of this Bill is to secure that every child shall have the opportunity of seeing what is in him, and of rising, if his capacities fit him for it, to even the highest position which is attainable. I need not go into the provision this Bill makes to secure that elementary instruction shall be thoroughly given. Many of the Church schools have been on a level with the best board schools with regard to efficiency, but unfortunately it is the case that in a great many other instances, owing to the want of funds they have stood on a lower level. That will be made good by the Bill. Secondary education will be provided, and every child may pass from a good elementary to a good secondary school if fit for it.

I would just call the attention of the House to one most valuable provision of the Bill which I think has been a good deal overlooked. It is contained in the second sub-Section of Clause 23. By that, power is given to the local education authority, with the consent of the Board of Education, to extend the age limit for attendance at elementary schools "in the case of any such school if no suitable higher education is available within a reasonable distance of the school." I regard that as a most valuable provision. It entirely obviates the remark I have sometimes heard made that there may be a difficulty under the system established in the way of a child who wishes to pass on to a secondary school if that school is at some distance.

This Bill I regard as a great democratic measure, and I believe it will be recognised as such. I was astounded to hear—"amazed," I think, was the word used by my noble friend—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen say that the working men had condemned the measure because they thought it sacrificed their interest to that of the clergy. What I would say is this, that such ideas might obtain some currency during the autumn campaign. No doubt at that time there was an enormous amount of very gross misrepresentation as to the nature and effect of the Bill. I have been told that a great many working men were under the impression that it was a Bill to abolish the board schools. I have heard hon. Members in this House very often, when they meant to talk of a board school talk of a School Board. The impression received currency on account of the misrepresentations of some who were interested in stirring up the agitation against the Bill; but these misrepresentations have really in many cases been so gross that they could not bear the light, and they have disappeared in the course of the thorough discussion the Bill has undergone in Committee. I believe the working men will appreciate the true character of this Bill. They will take the measure of the Bill, and they will take the measure of those who desire to utilise them for political purposes. The Bill is in all essentials what it was when introduced into the House. I do not believe that there ever has been a Bill of so much importance which has passed through the House less changed than this Bill has done. Reference has been made over and over again to the changes which have been made. The Government have not been deaf to suggestions. We have developed the Bill where it was desirable, and made clear what was already implied. The Bill upon which we have been engaged so long will very soon be tested in actual work. All those

> "Gorgons, and Hydras, and Chimeras dire,"

which the imagination of hon. Gentlemen on the platform during the autumn conjured up, have now disappeared before the light of day. The working of the Bill as an Act will be in the hands of the country, and I believe that the practical genius and the sound common-sense of the English people will show that this is a measure which works without friction and worthily achieves those great results for which it is intended.

(5.30.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I agree with the Attorney General that there has been no substantial change in the character of the Bill. It is just as bad now as it was six months ago. There are no improvements in it. There is just as much public control and just as much sectarianism, and perhaps a little more. But I was exceedingly surprised to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman say that this was a Bill to enable children of capacity to rise to the highest positions. Possibly the hon. and learned Gentleman was not thinking of the Nonconformist pupil teachers, who can never hope to rise beyond the pupil teacher stage. They can obtain assistant masterships, but never rise to the highest positions in the schools. Before the hon. and learned Gentleman makes any more statements I should advise him to read the Bill.

With regard to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, I am not going to take part in the brilliant ping-pong match between the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich and the Attorney General; but I thought it was a significant admission to make on the Third Reading, that this Amendment is to be changed in another place. What has happened to induce them to mutilate this Amendment to such an extent? I think it has something to do with what the hon. and learned Gentleman calls, not collision but pressure. With regard to the Scotch system. The learned Attorney General said that the Scotch system had been repudiated by the majority of the Members sitting on this side. He was challenged on that statement. We asked him to name one person who in any way repudiated it, and he could not do so. He said it had been repudiated by the majority. That is not my view at all. Then he said this was not an ideal solution. I was glad to hear that statement. At any rate it is not the best. There are two alternatives which would have been better than the present Bill. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that probably the best system is a system where the control is in the hands of the people and the education given in the schools is absolutely unsectarian, and I also agree that there is no chance of the people accepting such a system; but even without that there are two systems which are better. The Scotch system is better. The Scotch system obtains now in some of the most important centres in Wales. In the Rhondda Valley, for instance, where every denomination agreed to develop a syllabus of religious instruction, drafted by the vicar of the parish, and there there is perfect peace. I have seen the Scotch system at work, and it is a success. Then there is the other alternative which the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Greenwich suggests, but shrinks from the Manitoba, Ontario, and New South Wales systems. Both those systems have worked well and have eliminated the religious controversy for ever. Everybody who knows the evil which this religious controversy has wrought knows how necessary it is to eliminate it. These two systems, which found acceptance not merely among the moderate men of both sides but among men like the hon. Member for Tunbridge, who is not generally regarded as moderate on Church matters, are put on one side for the sake of perpetuating a system which only keeps up the bitterness and irritation which has been the bane of education for the last fifty years. I believe either of those alternatives would have been more popular.

The Government's scheme has not the advantage of being really popular. Where is the popular feeling in favour of the Bill? It has been repudiated on every occasion when the test of popular opinion has been applied. Those were remarkable figures published in *The Times* yesterday as to the results of the municipal contests. Wherever there have been contests on the issue of the Education Bill they have resulted in large majorities against it. Although 109 Unionist Members have been returned as against fifty-three Liberal Members, still, in the municipal contests, there has been a majority of five to four against the Education Bill. That is a remarkable indication of the state of public opinion in the only way in which we can test it at the present moment. And every attempt to get up a counter-agitation has failed. The Albert Hall meeting was not a public meeting, though the clergy acted as recruiting sergeants *ad hoc*. There was one exception. There was a smoking concert held in support of the Bill somewhere in the South of England. So little confidence had those who organised it in the Bill that they appealed with influences spirituous rather than spiritual in their nature, and thought it best to pass the resolution and to say as little as possible about it. "Captain Cook kindly gave a number of selections on his fine double-trumpet instrument," and he sang to this great meeting in support of the Bill, "Wait till the clouds roll by," and by way of referring to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment he sang "The Happy Family," and ended up with "Good Old Joe." It was a little irrelevant to the Education Bill, but its effect was good, because I see it ended in an "unanimous and enthusiastic" resolution in favour of the Education Bill. With that exception I have failed to find any indication of the opinion of the people in this country in favour of it.

Why, Sir, any system you could find in force in any part of the Empire would be better than this. It does not really produce a settlement, but quite the reverse. It converts the precarious holding that a favoured sect had upon the education of the children of the land into a freehold, but we shall continue to contest the title, and we shall appeal to a higher tribunal and reverse the decision. The result of this religious element has been that this country is the most backward of all really civilised countries in its educational system, and this is the country which can best afford to do the best for education and least afford to do the worst. We depend more upon education than any of our great rivals, yet compare the educational system of this country, not with the United States, but with a little country like Switzerland. What is the remarkable way in which it works out? I take my figures from the excellent Reports supplied by the Board of Education. I find that while England spends a farthing per head of the population on secondary education, Wales spends twenty times that, and Switzerland spends fifty-five times as much. The county of Gloucester and the Canton of Berne are comparable in size and population. Let us take those. I find in Berne they spend £147,000 out of the common cantonal rates on education, and Gloucester spends £7,000. In Berne there are seventy-three secondary schools, one university, one school of fine arts, one veterinary school, five training colleges for primary teachers, and one training college for secondary teachers; in Gloucester there is one training college for the whole of that part of the country and not only from Gloucester, and no secondary schools set up from public funds. What advantage has Gloucester got? Is its theology better than that of Berne? Are the morals of Gloucester better? Is Gloucester cheese even better? I am very doubtful of it. Take the comparison from another point of view. You find this little country, Switzerland, doing ten times as much for education as these rich counties of England, but, on the other hand, the police rate of Gloucester is four times as much as that of Berne.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): Does the hon. Gentleman say the police rate of Gloucester is higher than the police rate of the other counties of England?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, I said it was higher than that of Berne.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: It is not above the general average of England.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not saying it is. I suggest that the police rate in Berne is one-fourth what it is in Gloucester.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: What is the police rate in Switzerland? What is it in the pound?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: If the hon. Member had known the rating system of Switzerland he would not have asked that question.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: Then you cannot make a comparison.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: If the hon. Member challenges me I will give him the exact figures. £50,000 is spent in Gloucester for police ——

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: You are nearly doubling the amount.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: Perhaps the hon. Member will state the exact sum.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: It is about £30,000.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is about half. If the hon. Baronet tells me the total expenditure for police in Gloucester is only £30,000, I accept his statement; but I suggest to him that the total for local and imperial police is £60,000, of which the State pays half. I simply instanced this in order to point out how backward we are compared with other countries. This is due very largely to the fact that sectarian controversy has kept us back, I do not say that a denominational system is necessarily incompatible with good education; that is not the question. Where you get a homogeneous people it does not much matter, there is not much harm then, but when you have the people split up into fifty different sects there are only two alternatives which could be adopted. You must either deal with the question as the United States deals with it, by keeping out all religious dogma, or, as some of the Colonies have done, by giving facilities with complete popular control.

Let me point out one or two instances where I think the perpetuation of this sectarian system damages education. For one thing, it preserves a dual control, if that is a proper description of what will happen after this Bill becomes law, a very bad principle in any kind of management. In some of the functions the managers will be subordinate to the local authority; in others the managers will divide the authority with the Councils; in others the managers will be superior to the Councils; in others the authority will be divided between the managers, the clergyman, and the Bishop, which is the Kenyon-Slaney plot. Again, it would be divided between the managers, the Council, and the Board of Education; indeed, nobody can tell in whom the powers are vested. This is not dual control; it is multiple control, and it is impossible to have an efficient system under it. These sectarian differences which you are keeping alive are very injurious to efficiency. You will have men going on to these bodies purely and solely to keep down the level of School Board efficiency in the interest of the rival concern. It is exactly as if you had a man with a trading concern of his own going on to the board of a rival concern. What would he do? He would resist the sinking of capital for the purposes of improving and increasing the trade of the concern on the board of which he sat, in the interests of his own concern; and when you put a man interested in voluntary schools on the management of a provided school, naturally in the interest of the system in which he is most interested he will use his position to cripple that system he least believes in. On the other hand, what happens? You not only get the non-provided men trying to cripple the provided schools, but the men opposed to the sectarian schools doing their best to keep down the expenditure of those schools. So you get this rivalry, not to raise the level of education, but to depreciate it, and you place religious zeal permanently against educational efficiency in this country.

There is another element which this Bill introduces for the first time—the distracting influence of religious controversy in local administration. If you introduce religion into any question it is a matter so absorbing in debate that that element must dominate every other minor consideration. If anyone wants to know how distracting this religious element in administration is, let him look at the debates of this House. The Prime Minister complained that education was scarcely heard of in the debates, and that every debate had gone back to the same old religious discussion. As long as religion was mixed up with administration that result can only be expected. It is the most important element, and how can you keep it under? You are bound to get to it; that is what we complain of. Take the Kenyon-Slaney discussion, and in describing it in that way I do not refer to the hon. and gallant Member as a man, but to the hon. Member as an institution. I watched it as an impartial observer, I took no part in the action, I thought it was better to keep out of it, that it was dangerous. There were the High and Low Churches firing at close quarters; there was cross-firing by Nonconformists and Roman Catholics, and for a humorous non-combatant I thought it looked too dangerous, and I took cover. What happened? For two days you felt it coming. There were important Amendments on the Paper, but the House had no patience with them, management, control, appointment of teachers; excellent Amendments which ought to have been discussed from a business point of view. But we passed them all over; we wanted to get to religion, and when it was reached we said, "Thank heaven, here is religion at last; now for a row." It was like a whirlpool. You felt its power of suction days beforehand, drawing everything to it with increasing celerity. My hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell, whom I expected to see a rock in the rapids, was swept away like a lath, and for hours this House swirled round and round in the vortex of a mad frenzy of theological controversy. On the following day who was here? Not many. The House looked like a meeting of the Corporation after a big City dinner. That is what will happen all through the country. Directly you bring in religion it will be the dominant consideration in every discussion. I speak as an alderman of long standing. What do hon. Members think the Agenda Paper will be like? You will probably see on the County Council Agenda Paper questions affecting roads and bridges and the like, all matters affecting the comfort, business, and convenience of the people very largely, and—after this Bill is passed—probably the expediency of adding a new wing to the county lunatic asylum. But, whatever is on and whatever is off, one thing is certain, that on the subject of education there will be a long list of Motions. From one part of the county there will be a row about the appointment, and in another about the dismissal of teachers; the Anglican maypole will come up for discussion; complaints will be made that one denomination is being unduly favoured in the matter of schools, while another denomination will be complaining that they are not favoured enough, and there will be controversies about the violation of the Conscience Clause. Endless questions will crop up.

You may say, "Nothing of this kind occurred in Wales," and that is true, because we introduced into our intermediate Education Act, with the consent of the Unionist Government, a Clause that no dogmatic formulary of any kind should be taught in the schools. What is the result? There is not five minutes given to the discussion of religious controversy in the County Councils of Wales from one end to the other. We keep it all outside, and that is what you want to do here if you want to do business for education. Why you should introduce these matters I have never been able to understand. Supposing these items came last on the Agenda Paper, will there be any patience shown to discuss roads and bridges, or other humdrum and dull, but very necessary and important, matters of local administration? County councillors will be whipped up, as the laity of the Church were whipped up by the bishops and clergy for the Albert Hall meeting, and no time will be allowed for the discussion of the really important business of the Council. They will want to get to the religious controversy. There will be closure by compartments introduced in every County Council in the land. That is what you will get. In every County and Town Council the question of the repression of popery in the village schools will be debated, whereas they ought to be discussing the suppression of swine fever. The Thirty-nine Articles will become part of the Standing Orders of every Town Council; you will have Kenyon-Slaneys arising in every county, keeping watch and ward over village Cecils. This is the state of things that will arise.

What on earth have these dogmas to do with religion? One hon. Member says it is the right of the parent. What right has the parent to dictate to the State that the State should at its own expense teach any theology? I do not know that the parents have a right to demand that the State should teach anything. It is not a question of the right of the parent, but of the interest of the community, and is it in the interest of the community that it should intervene in these squabbles between forty or fifty different sects? You cannot say the Church has a right and the Primitive Methodists have not. If all these exercise their rights you split up education and shatter it to atoms. Lord Salisbury said with regard to India that the Government had a great horror of using its authority as a partisan of one religion more than another. Those were wise words, and I wish the statesmanship which is good enough to be applied to the people of India could be applied to the people of England and Wales. It is altogether a question of the interest of the community. I do not know that the community has a right to teach theology, but hon. Members opposite ought to be logical. If it is the business of the community to teach theology it should not confine the theology to one kind. Hon. Members say "But we have an Established Church," but the same arguments as they use can be used in favour of the unendowed Churches and schools. The hon. and learned Member for Stretford a few days ago said, "Take care that you do not offend the clergy, for if you do, the moment their energies are withdrawn from these schools they will disappear." If they did, what becomes of this great craving of hundreds and thousands of parents for definite Christian teaching if this is simply a Clerical agitation? Hon. Members opposite say dogma is essential. Who at the present moment is their ideal of a great British patriot? The Member for West Birmingham—the right hon. Gentleman who belongs to the least orthodox of the Churches; he is not a believer in the dogmatic religion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, and yet nobody doubts the genuineness of his patriotism. Dogma, therefore, even from the point of view of hon. Gentlemen opposite, is not essential to British statesmanship. I am not sure that the Prime Minister is not a schismatic, according to the notions of the noble Lord. Even he is not safe, if it depends upon dogma. He is the sort of man that the noble Lord prays the Good Lord to deliver us from on Sundays and Feast days.

After all, these are not the things that make a good citizen. Look at the things that are asked to be taught. I am sorry to have to refer to them, but when our religion demands it these things must be mentioned. What is it the Church asks should be taught? It teaches a truncated Creed. Take the two or three things wherein the Churches really differ. They are not things you ought to teach children. Take the doctrine of the godfather and the godmother. Those who have got them are within the sphere of influence of a religious organisation. Therefore, they do not need them. As for those who have not got them, why on earth should they be harassed and tormented for not having them? It is not to them you ought to talk; it is to the parents. The children cannot mend it, so what is the good of talking about it in school? Or take the theory about being humble and lowly to your betters. That is really teaching a political creed. Let me give an example—I am not talking of those creeds which some of the clergy believe in. Take a thing of this sort—we repudiate it and say you have no right to teach it. "Order yourselves lowly and reverently to all your betters." That is all right—but it depends upon who your betters are. Those who are taught in the training colleges, which are maintained at the public expense, are instructed how they are to explain these things. "Who are our betters? Those in a higher position than ourselves, either by birth, wealth, or office." I wonder if the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich acts up to that. How does he treat the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs? Does he show him that deference which is due to his Catechismal superiority? As a true son of the Catechism I am myself always perplexed how to act. I meet many men; I know nothing about their worldly circumstances, and have no time to look into their family pedigree. What am I to do? Should I say, "I am at a loss to know whether you ought to take off your hat to me, or I to you. Would you mind, in order to assist me, telling me what your balance at your banker's is?" If I get the answer, "It is so much," I am to immediately take off my hat and say, "Sir, your obedient servant." I say they have no right to teach this repulsive snobbery. [Cheers and cries of "Oh."] It is this repulsive snobbery from which the Carpenter's Son suffered. I have seen columns in *The Times* filled with this: "Undenominational teaching in the Board Schools is obnoxious to Churchmen." To teach kindness, goodness, honesty, purity, temperance, charity—this is undenominational, obnoxious to all good Churchmen! To teach them to cringe before wealth; yes, this is pure religion and undefiled, and therefore you ought to endow it. It is perfectly definite. You are to order yourselves humbly and lowly to wealth. That is not the teaching I would have. I would rather have the words which the American schools teach: "If any man be great among you let him be your servant." All the great Presidents of America have been poor men without a pedigree.

I have only one word to add. There is a clear issue before the country. Public control—yes, and if you are going to teach religion in the schools, teach it from the Book which is acceptable to all Christians. Give the Bible to the children. It is done by the board schools, and I have seen even bishops commend the way it is explained. There is one thing that always struck me about these tenets of the Church Catechism—how irrelevant they are to the real perils that children have to encounter in life. Give the children the Bible if you want to teach them the Christian faith. Let it be expounded to them by its Founder. Stop this brawling of priests in and around the schools, so that the children may hear Him speak to them in His own words. I appeal to the House of Commons now, at the eleventh hour, to use its great influence and lift its commanding voice and say, "Pray silence for the Master."

*(6.12.) MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Very early in the Autumn Session, I believe before the Autumn Session commenced, the hon. Member who has just sat down, speaking outside this House with all that delightful contempt for accuracy of description with which he so often entertains us, described the Government and this Bill as a hen sitting on an addled egg, the chicken from which would get lost in the November fogs, but today we see that the chicken has come safely through the November fogs, and is about to be sent forth a thriving bird, destined to become a veritable Methuselah among fowls. Not a few on both sides of the House, I am glad to think, are prepared to attribute this result, to a large extent, to the skilful leadership of the Prime Minister, of whom the Leader of the Opposition, in these education debates, truly said the other evening, "That if he had to hang a man he would take care to do it with a silken cord." When the country heard the Bill described as "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity"—a description which I was glad to hear the hon. Member for Oldham repudiate with contempt—when the country heard of "School Boards being butchered to make a parson's holiday"—a phrase easily recognised as being by the author of the other historical phrase with regard to "smoking hecatombs of slaughtered babes"—it soon came to the conclusion that the Bill could not be so bad as it was painted, and it was then an easy step to arrive at—the further conclusion that it was a much better Bill than it at first expected. Now I think it is generally recognised that the agitation is dying down, if it is not already dead, and the task with which hon. Members opposite are face to face at the present moment is that of devising some means or method by which to keep it alive. On that point I cannot expect my opinion to be taken as of much value, but fortunately I have the direct testimony of the Free Church Federation, because the Rev. Dr. Guinness Rogers stated the other day at a meeting in the Farringdon Hall that there was a danger before the Act came into operation of a subsidence of the zeal which was now stirring them, and that every means must be taken to keep it alive, "every means" being pleasantly suggestive of the fact that "the resources of civilisation are not yet exhausted." I can almost imagine the death-bed scene. I think I see Dr. Clifford fittingly in attendance on the dying patient; the Leader of the Opposition present, with some doubt as to whether he wishes the agitation to expire or to recover, and the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs vigorously, but in vain, trying to keep up an artificial supply of oxygen.

Instead of the agitation having had the anticipated effect in the country, it has entirely missed fire. If I ask myself why it has missed fire, I should answer the question on two grounds. First, because it was based far too much in some quarters on dislike and jealousy of the National Church; and, secondly, because of an exaggerated and misconceived idea of the gullibility of the people in this 20th century, neither of which factors are as potent as they once were. Not even the most frantic efforts to label the new education rate as the old Church rate have induced the country to believe such a false idea, and instead of a surging mass of the Opposition returning to the House immediately the Autumn Session commenced with the ultimatum, "Withdraw, or dissolve!" we have had the spectacle of some half of their number in attendance, trying either to obstruct the Measure or to obtain modifications and concessions. Moreover the attitude of the Opposition has not always been the same inside and outside the House. It may be considered clever—no doubt it is very 'cute—but I find it difficult to think much politically of the hon. Member who has just addressed the House—who has spent much time here in endeavouring to obtain modifications of the Measure, and has then proceeded to address meetings in the country, and to warn his audiences against the Ministerial concessions "because they are part of the whole trick and business of the Government." There were two main arguments which had been advanced against the Bill—first, that there is no mandate from the country; and, secondly, that in the Bill, even as now amended, there is no popular control. So far as regards the "no mandate" argument, I am content to leave that in the position in which it was left by the right hon. Gentleman, my predecessor in the representation of Newcastle, when speaking recently within the sacred precincts of the National Liberal Club. I will trouble the House with only one phase of it. Where was the mandate for the Education Bill of 1870? It is notorious that the General Election of 1868 was fought upon one question, and one question only, viz., the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and though it may be said that there was a reference to education in the election address of Mr. Gladstone, similar references may be found in the addresses of hon. Members on this side who stood at the last General Election. Where, then, was the mandate for the establishment of School Boards in 1870—for the establishment of the system which has so heavily handicapped the voluntary schools ever since?

As regards "no control," I pass by the statement of the hon. Member for North Camberwell that "all the best educated countries in the world have municipalised education," not because I undervalue his authority, but because I have noticed that whenever we quote him against his colleagues on that side of the House, we are always met with the reply, "Oh, Macnamara he is an educationalist!"—as much as to say that he is no Liberal. I would ask the House therefore to listen to two voices of 1170. The first is that of the late Mr. Mundella, who said that—

> "He was satisfied that no greater mistake could be committed than that of leaving school boards to be elected by the popular vote."

The other voice is that of Mr. George Dixon, of Birmingham, who was not only a Liberal, but also an educationalist, and who declared, speaking from his place in the House of Commons—

> "I really do wish my hon. friends, taking the same view of politics, belonging to the same Radical school as myself, would have a little more confidence in what I have always supposed to be one of the chief Radical doctrines, viz., trust in municipal government elected by the ratepayers."

I venture to think that the annoyance, to use no stronger term, manifested from the Benches opposite, has been due to the realisation of the fact that they have—fairly or unfairly, from whichever point they may choose to regard it—been cheated out of what they looked upon as a great opportunity of damaging the National Church. We have been told by the hon. Member for Rugby, in his famous horse story, that when he goes to buy a horse he expects to carry away at the same time and for the same money not only the horse, but also the bridle and saddle. In short, in language with which in his professional association with persons accustomed to stand at the bar of justice he must be familiar, he expected to "collar the lot." In this case I believe hon. Members opposite not only expected they would secure the Church horse, the Church bridle and the Church saddle, but they also thought they ought to have the conveyance and the stables as well, and because they had been disappointed in that expectation, we have—again to use legal phraseology—had that exhibition of "incompatibility of temper" which has been so noticeable in the discussions. The last resort of hon. Members opposite is to throw up their hands in pious horror at the operation of the Closure. It seems to me ridiculous. They have as much right to complain of the Closure as the man who murdered both his father and mother had to ask for mercy from the judge on the ground that he was an orphan. Whose fault was it that he was an orphan? Why, his own, of course, and he knew it. Whose fault was it that the Closure has operated against hon. Members opposite? Why, their own, of course, and not only did they know it, but, what is of far greater consequence, the country knows it to.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I look upon the question affected by this Bill through the spectacles neither of Roman Catholics, nor of Anglicans, nor of Nonconformists, but simply of one who desires to see a sound system of education established throughout the country. I believe that that system will never be established so long as the line of demarcation between the functions of the State and the functions of the individual is not maintained. The function of the State is to look after secular education, and that of the individual—the parent or the pastor—is to look after religious education. If ever you try to evade the function of the individual and place it on the State you will fall into all sorts of difficulties, and education will suffer. My hon. friend has praised the excellences of undogmatic religion. I am surprised that anyone should assert in this House that there could be such a thing as undogmatic Christianity. The words are an absolute contradiction in terms. Non-dogmatic morality has been spoken of, but to tell us that you are able to get a religion based upon a supernatural revelation to men, and you can do so without accepting the dogmatisms of that religion, seems to me to be an utter absurdity and a contradiction in terms. What is the consequence of breaking down the barrier? When once you break down the barrier you will have men wanting to go further. The result of teaching religion in board schools is that you have denominational religion in a great many schools, and education becomes the battle-ground of rival sects. Why was this Bill brought in? Was it because of the Cockerton judgment? If so, why did you not limit it to that? Was it for the benefit of secondary education? If so, why did you not limit it to that? The real reason why this Bill was brought in—and hon. Gentlemen opposite must be well aware of it—was that there were 8,000 parishes in England where there was a Church school, and the subscriptions so fell off that, although the education was starved, the schools were in a state of absolute bankruptcy. That is the real reason. This is the richest Church in the world. It is the Church which contains most of the rich men in England, and it does seem to me something mean and contemptible on the part of rich Churchmen that if they believe in the doctrines of their own Church they should not be ready to pay a certain portion to meet the cost of their schools instead of sponging upon others.

I respect all religions equally, and I have no objection to any man in the world believing in anything he pleases, and inculcating it on others, but I object to him calling upon us to pay for the teaching of that religion. Let each sect sit like a hen on their own eggs and hatch them, and not use the State as a sort of incubator to hatch its own sectional eggs. We know the old proverb that he who pays for the music has a right to call the tune, but when we are asked to pay for this, and when we are allowed to call the tune, I do not think it will be a Church tune. By this Bill the Government have had to invade one of the most elementary principles of control over the money which is found by the State. The Government were trying to blink the whole question. In one Clause of this Bill power is given for the appointment of managers. Six of them are appointed for a school, four of them being put upon the board by the Church itself. I wonder what would be said if it were proposed that the Liberal Party should be allowed to co-opt two-thirds of the Members of this House. It is a mere farce and ridiculous to talk about these six managers, four of whom are co-opted, as being representatives of the parish in which the schools are situated. The First Lord of the Treasury said that although they were called managers they did not manage. If they do not manage, who is it that does manage? I contend that they do manage, because they have the right to appoint the master. If you will only provide that I shall be allowed to appoint the masters of the schools, I will undertake to turn the rising generation into thoroughly sound Radicals without a Conservative amongst them.

One speaker has said that these schools are an annexe to the Church, and he said they were also an annexe to the family. If so, why do you not allow the heads of the family to interfere in any sort of way? It has been said that the country desires to have this Bill, but if that is so why will you not leave the matter to the country? If the country really desires this system of managers why not leave it to the parishioners and the parents of the children to have a voice in the matter, and to have a supreme voice to decide what is to be done in the schools. There is another elementary principle of self-government as it is recognised in this country which has been trampled under foot, and that is the principle that there should be no obligation upon a civil servant to state his religion, much less to hold any particular religion. You have in these 8,000 schools 8,000 masters who are practically civil servants, and who are only appointed if they belong to the Church of England; in fact they must belong to the Church of England in order to get the appointment. What can a Bill be worth that tramples upon two such elementary principles of civil liberty and civil rights as this Bill does? I can understand perfectly well this proposal if the school happens to be situated in a place where other schools are entirely out of the reach of the children, but you must remember that this is not the case in the 8,000 parishes where there is only one school, and in that one school you make it obligatory that every child in the parish shall attend. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was a statute obliging everybody to attend the parish church, and what is the difference between that and obliging children to attend these schools? The result of this policy is that the children are forced into a school where there is a Church atmosphere.

We have talked a good deal about the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, and it is not an edifying spectacle to see the Church members quarrelling like cats and dogs over this Amendment. I took no interest in it at all. It was a matter of perfect indifference to me. Not that I object at all to the clergymen, but I object to the Church. If you have Church schools supported at the public expense it does not concern me so much how the money shall be allocated between the clergymen and the laymen, for I object alike to both clergy and laity having anything to do with it. When the First Lord of the Treasury passed his Closure by compartments, I came to the conclusion that I would not take part in the discussions in fetters. I object to being fettered or muzzled, and therefore I did not give one single vote after Closure by compartments was passed either in Committee or on Report. What happened? No sooner was the Closure passed than the right hon. Gentleman began to give sops to the clerical party and the clerical representatives on the other side of the House. He could not give the clerical party all they wanted, and so the right hon. Gentleman tried to make it up by doles, State grants, and in other ways, and he gave them the fees and the school houses. He gave these, I suppose, as a sort of inducement to them to fall into line and to accept his Bill. What occurred in regard to the Amendments? A very large number of Amendments were put down on the Paper by hon. Members of both sides of the House, and how many of them were put from the Chair? I do not suppose that more than half-a-dozen of them were discussed. All these Amendments were put down by hon. Gentlemen who had made a speciality of these particular subjects and who had studied the question, and they were anxious to amend the Bill, but all their efforts were swept entirely away by this Closure by compartments.

Therefore many of the proposals in this Bill have been carried without any discussion at all, and now the House is called upon to say that that is a proper mode in which to legislate. I think that is a mode of reducing this House to contempt in the sight of the country, and I absolutely decline to have anything to do with it. But sometimes good comes out of bad. Disestablishment, or the desire for it, was a living force at one time in the country, but I do not know whether that matter is on our slate at the present time, because the Liberal slate has been cleaned, and if disestablishment has not been wiped off altogether it certainly has been a little blurred of late. I hope the effect of this Bill will be to write it large again on our slate. The Church, directly it felt itself safe in its own laager, issued forth and raided in our country. Churchmen said "As we have an endowed Church and the country is so foolish as to accept this, they will perhaps allow us to have endowed Church schools," and it appears to me that they have been pretty right in that view. I do not blame the Tories for this for an instant. We cannot expect to get grapes from Tory thorns. I blame the country for sending the Tories to this House with a majority. I find, however, one consolation in what has occurred. I think that the Church has proved itself so aggressive in this matter that it is exceedingly possible that Liberals will unite to expel them from the fortress in which they have retired. This was done with the robber barons of the Rhine. They sallied forth and plundered the neighbouring country, and at last the neighbouring country became so disgusted that they were not satisfied with defending their own, but they went and levelled the fortresses of those barons. That I hope will be the result of this Bill. I think the result will be that the Church schools in the end will suffer. I think the Church has overreached itself. Why were these schools established in the parishes? It was simply because it was a means of avoiding school rates. Now you have school rates whether they are to be voluntary schools, Church schools, or board schools. Now that you have taken the rates and deprived the ratepayers of control over the money, now that you have gone back to the old principle, that a man to be a civil servant of the country is to be a member of the Church of England, I think you will find, although perhaps you did not absolutely intend it, that the end will be the ending of those Church schools, and that is a result I most sincerely desire.

I think this debate has shown how impossible it is to have any good system of education so long as you do not lay it down that there should be nothing but secular education taught by the State with State money. Have you heard much of education in these debates? Complaint has been made on all sides that instead of education you have had nothing but sectarian bickerings. The children are concerned in this matter. I have heard a great deal about the teachers, and this and that, but the children have hardly ever been mentioned at all. There is no doubt that we are entirely behind other nations in the matter of education, and if we hope to hold our own with foreign countries we must educate our people up to the mark of the inhabitants of Germany, and the United States who compete with us in foreign markets. There is no doubt that if the country had not allowed itself to be carried away a short time ago, and had not rushed wildly into the reckless folly into which it was recommended to rush by a sensational Press, we should not have been spending so much money on war as we are doing at the present moment. What is going on at present in the country? I am not going to transgress by pursuing this subject, which would be out of order, but I may be allowed to point out that, while we, in the House of Commons, are quarrelling, and nagging, and bickering over the religious question in connection with schools, in another place we had a noble Lord proposing that the educational deficiency should be met by establishing a public holiday every year at which there were to be speeches made, as far as I understand him, on behalf of Birmingham Imperialism, and the little people were to be bribed into support of this by having a festival. I know that soldiers are needed, but there is something beyond being a soldier, and it is time to protest against this clericalism which has invaded the Benches on the other side of the House, and against the militarism which has not only invaded the Benches on the other side, but to a large and serious extent the Benches on this side. I want good citizens to be made, and I believe that a good citizen can be made without his being converted either into being a member of the Church of England or into a soldier. I recognise that we must have soldiers, and I have no objection to anybody who likes being a member of the Church of England, but I do hold that a sound, large, and broad system of education is infinitely better for this country than if we were to manage to take the other half of Africa at a further cost of about £250,000,000, even if we were to spend double what we are now spending on ships and armaments and soldiers.

*(6.50.) **MR. TALBOT**: So far as I can understand the somewhat discursive remarks of the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken, he is really in favour of a simply secular system of education. Well, it is not really worth while to argue that question to-night, because the country has long ago made up its mind against the hon. Gentleman. When I say that, I say that not this House only, but that the whole community, has declared in the most unmistakable manner that secular education, pure and simple, is a thing they will not have, and therefore it would be a waste of the time of the House to reply to the arguments which have been adduced. The argument with regard to militarism is not germane to the question we are discussing

tonight, and I may also pass that by. I shall confine my remarks, which will be very few, entirely to matters connected with the Bill which we are now asked to read a third time.

Two points have struck me notably in regard to the discussions on the Bill. The first is that the opposition to the Bill has been based upon an extraordinary absence of reference to facts. Instead of facts we have had fictions. I am not going to weary the House with quotations, but I should like just to mention one or two of the remarks which have been made by the opponents of the Bill. I have here a statement by Dr. Clifford, the eminent Nonconformist divine. He says:

> "The Cabinet now pledges itself to effect the utter elimination of all the best elements of the present system of State education, and to secure the unchecked sway of the priest."

That is one of his statements, and another is this:

> "This Bill, according to Mr. Bryce, takes the board schools from the people, and gives them, roughly speaking, to one section of the people—that is, to the Anglican Church. That is the fact. A heavier condemnation of the Bill and of its promoters could not be uttered."

I asked myself when I read these extraordinary statements, "Who is making these remarks?" I believe Dr. Clifford is an able and a conscientious man, but I must say that they are most misleading and absolutely inaccurate statements. It is difficult for me in dealing with such statements to confine myself to Parliamentary expressions. The latter statement that the board schools had been taken from the people and given to one section of the people—those belonging to the Anglican Church—is absolutely contrary to the whole truth about the Bill. I wondered whether I was dreaming, or whether it was a statement which had really been made by a responsible person. Dr. Clifford is a good and able man, but when he cites the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen as his authority for a statement so absolutely contrary to the truth, I am driven to this dilemma: either Dr. Clifford does not know the facts—in which case he ought not to speak about them—or he does know them, and speaks what are not the facts. If the latter alternative is true, I cannot designate such conduct in language which would be in accordance with the Rules of the House. In a northern part of the country, where an election has lately taken place, one of the arguments used against the candidate who supported the Government was that, if this Bill were passed, the universal payment of school fees would be enforced for every child. [AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?] I am told that was so. I am quoting the handbills which were circulated in the Cleveland Division, the constituency to which I refer. The hon. Gentlemen who represents the constituency is not here at present. He was here yesterday and made an interesting maiden speech to the House, and I wish he had been here now to have repudiated the statement I have made if it is not correct. That is another absolute mis-statement. In former controversies we have generally been agreed on the facts. I take the case of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, which is the first in which I was personally engaged. We knew then what was the proposal of the Government. Some of us thought it was a bad thing to disestablish the Irish Church, and others thought it was a good thing. There was a very proper distinction of opinion, but here it is impossible to argue with hon. Gentlemen opposite if they take their stand on statements of this kind, and if we do not agree on the elementary facts of the situation, it is impossible to come to close quarters. I regret as much as anyone can do the introduction of this new element into Parliamentary controversies, which, if allowed to spread, would make the debates in this House almost useless. We have heard a great deal about the undue advantage to the Church. That is a matter upon which we may naturally take different views. It is perfectly reasonable that one person should think these provisions give undue advantage to the Church, while another person takes a different view; but to say that the Bill takes away the board schools and gives them over to the Church is an absolute perversion of the fact, and I should have expected that it would have been repudiated by hon. Members opposite. I regret that we have to deal with them from that point of view.

I should like to ask the House to allow me to correct a statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen in his speech last night. I have here a letter which has been put into my hand, and I have been asked to make use of it.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen said that the Bishop of London, at the Albert Hall meeting, estimated the cost of repairs for Church schools at £150,000 per annum; and then the right hon. Gentleman went on to show that the proportion of fees and endowments the Church would receive (which he treated as a gift to the Church) was £162,000, so that the burden said to be laid upon Churchmen was a fiction; the whole cost would be provided for them with a balance of £12,000, and that the Bill was an endowment of the Church. Now, a reference to the report of the Albert Hall meeting will show that that is not an accurate statement of what the Bishop of London said. The Bishop says that he never made the statement attributed to him, and his Lordship has this morning given me authority to say that he not only did not make it, but that what he said was absolutely inconsistent with it. The information supplied to me is that there are nearly 3,000,000 places in Church schools, and that the cost of structural and annual repairs is at least 5s. a head. The London School Board estimates 3s. 6d. a head for annual repairs only.

DR. MACNAMARA: The cost to the London School Board is only 5s. 3d.

*MR. TALBOT: The hon. Gentleman has a perfect right to his own opinion. He is an expert in these matters. The information supplied to me is that the cost for structural and annual repairs amounts to 5s. per head, and that that would amount to, on the calculation of 3,000,000 places in the Church schools, £750,000; whereas £150,000 would only allow 1s. a head for all repairs. Whether I am correct or not in the statement of annual cost, at any rate it will be evident that the statement attributed to the Bishop of London is absolutely inaccurate. There is another thing that strikes me about this Bill, which is remarkably different from most measures with which I have had to deal, and that is, that each side seems to expect that it will grant enormous advantages to the other side. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who oppose this Bill said it would be of enormous advantage to the Church; my hon. friends connected with the Church who support the Bill say they expect to reap no great advantage from it, but that a great deal of risk will be involved before a satisfactory conclusion has been arrived at. Probably the truth lies in this, as in most things, in the middle, and I trust that in the long run justice will be attained. Although we differ from hon. Gentlemen opposite, this, at any rate, we must acknowledge, as practical statesmen, that in a matter of this kind we are dealing not with what might be ideally best, but with the best under the circumstances. The hon. Gentleman, when he spoke of secular education, asked why the Government did not brush aside the whole existing condition of things; but he did not emphasise the fact that this country of England is permeated by a great system of religious education provided at an enormous cost. He said that the Church schools had been supplied in order to escape the school rates; but a great number of these Church schools were established long before there was any school rate by Churchmen, Churchwomen, and other religious people who were anxious for religious education. We cannot get rid of these schools because the hon. Member for Northampton wants a universal system of secular instruction. I am anxious to provide for religious education. We meet the facts of the case; we acknowledge that there are these denominational schools all over the country, and we cannot brush them aside as if they were non-existent. I am sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite, when they think the matter over calmly, will acknowledge that this is the only way this question can be dealt with. From existing facts must a national system be developed.

Before I sit down I should like to say a word or two about the celebrated Kenyon-Slaney Clause. I am quite sure that my hon. and gallant friend proposed that Clause not to throw obstacles in the way of what I have described as the object of the Government, but with a real and earnest desire to purge some of the Church schools of some of their defects, and to correct heresies that may exist in the Church. But in trying to do that he introduced into the Education Bill what I cannot but consider a provision of an alien character. In every period since the foundation of the Church there have been attempts to teach false doctrines. There is nothing new in that; but I do not think that an Education Bill is an occasion to establish the purity of the Church; and I know that this unfortunate Clause has introduced a great deal of bitterness into the discussion. However, at all events, there it is, and we cannot get rid of it; but I hope we shall try to get it made less injurious than I think it is likely to be. The Attorney General made a very interesting speech about it, and drew a distinction between the interpretation of two parts of this Clause. There were two reasons why I voted against the Clause. One was that it seemed to me to deprive the clergyman of the proper position he should hold in a Church school, and the other was that it takes away the appeal to the Bishop in a dispute between the managers and the clergyman. In regard to the first, the Attorney General did not think that there was any obscurity in regard to the position of the clergyman and the managers; and in regard to the second, my hon. and gallant friend, after hearing the Attorney General, said that he would be very glad if any obscurity which rests upon the Clause were put right in another place. In such questions it is of the greatest importance that there should be no obscurity whatever in the words of the Clause. These should, at least, say what they mean to say, so that there may be fewer floods of litigation, and less cases of dispute. That will be better for us all. We do not want to spend our time or money in fighting in the law courts. I do hope the Government will see that, when the Bill goes to the House of Lords, this Clause shall be made absolutely intelligible, and that whatever the Clause is intended to mean, that meaning shall be made perfectly clear.

There is another point I wish to bring before the House. I know I represent here a great deal of opinion outside in regard to it which does not often find articulate volume in this House. I refer to the single-school areas, on which there has been much exaggeration. It has been said that there are 8,000 single-school areas. That is a great mistake; I believe there are only 5,000, and in a large number of these no Nonconformist grievance exists, simply because there are no Nonconformists in the parish. However, I admit that in Wales, and in Lincolnshire, the West Riding of York, and in Cornwall, Nonconformist grievances do exist. Now, I am quite ready to meet a grievance, but I cannot meet one grievance by substituting another. What hon. Gentlemen opposite wish is to remove the Nonconformist grievance by making a Church grievance. That would not settle the question in any way. I am quite ready to allow any amount of religious teaching in schools for which there is a real demand; but when we proposed that it was met with opposition on the other side. They said it was absurd, although it seemed to me the very essence of Liberalism. I still believe that the proper solution of the question lies in my noble friend's Amendment, and that in the long run it will be seen that we were right and that that solution must come. When it does come, it will be acknowledged that we were the pioneers of a great educational reform.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I have been informed that while I was out of the House the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University stated that in the Cleveland election a leaflet was issued on my behalf stating that fees would be charged in all Church schools if this Bill became law. I have no knowledge of any such leaflet, and must ask the right hon. Gentleman to produce the leaflet.

*MR. TALBOT: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his correction, and I will take care that the information is supplied to him. I have not the leaflet with me. I only said I heard of it.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I think that the right hon. Gentleman should not have made the statement without being able to produce his authority.

*MR. TALBOT: When the hon. Gentleman has been longer in the House he will know that we do not always produce documents in support of statements that are made. I merely said that a report had reached me that a statement to that effect was made in the North of England. I did not say that the hon. Member was conscious of it. I say that in supporting this Bill we have been supporting the progress of the cause of education. I ask whether there is any alternative to the proposals of the Government. From my point of view of doing justice to the Church schools, though I by no means regard this Bill as perfect, I cannot say that any other scheme could have been produced with a chance of passing. I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite, in all fairness and honesty, whether any other scheme presents itself to them which can be reasonably proposed to the country. As regards the secularisation of all the schools in the country, that is out of the question. Nobody could think that the removal of the Church schools is a practical proposal. If that be so, if there is no other alternative, we must give to the Government measure the support which I think it deserves. This Bill has done much to establish a feeling of gratitude in the minds of all of us to the Prime Minister, and I ask for the privilege of a colleague to congratulate the Secretary to the Board of Education on the admirable way in which he has seconded the labours of his chief. This is one of the most difficult subjects, and it was almost impossible to bring it to a conclusion without friction; but when friction disappears and heat cools, the people of this country will, I believe, look back and recognise that in the Education Bill, and in the manner in which it was passed, they have secured a real triumph in the great cause of national education.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): We all of us must recognise the moderation and good sense which has characterised all the speeches we have had during this debate, including that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University. But hon. Gentlemen opposite must forgive me for pointing out that these are questions of great principles and that there is a diametrical opposition between the view of the mode in which these questions of education are treated by the right hon. Gentleman and those who support him, and the view of the mode in which we, on this side of the House, regard them. We readily recognise that the Church of England has a great position in our educational system. We readily recognise that no popular mandate was necessary for the purpose that some step should be taken by a responsible Government for the co-ordination and consolidation of education, and for elevating the voluntary denominational schools of the country up to the same standard of efficiency as that enjoyed by the board schools. But although we recognise the necessity for these changes, we are irresistibly forced to the conclusion that the methods adopted by the Government are not the methods which should, to the best advantage of the Government, have been pursued by the Government. This question of education must be divided into two parts—one religious and the other educational. On the educational part we, on this side of the House, are of opinion that the School Boards ought not to have been abolished. I do not see the Prime Minister present, but the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education is in his place, and I would ask him on what authority did this abolition of the School Boards rest before it was carried into effect, and by the manner in which it has been done by this Bill.

In 1895 a Royal Commission was appointed for the purpose of inquiring into technical instruction, and many persons of the greatest educational authority gave evidence before that Royal Commission. And with one or two exceptions, every witness of authority expressed the opinion that it was inadvisable to abolish the School Boards, but that, on the contrary, it was essential, in the interests of the cause of education, that the School Boards should be maintained. I would remind the House of a few of the authorities for that statement. I suppose that there are few more distinguished men in the cause of education in this country than Sir George Kekewich, who has been so long associated with the public Department of Education, and he gave his unqualified opinion in favour of that point. The same observation applies to the Head Master of King Edward VI. School, Birmingham—a gentleman who was also vice chairman of the Birmingham School Board. Another of the representatives of that School Board also gave his opinion against the abolition of the School Boards. On the same lines was the evidence of Mr. Anthony, chairman of the Liverpool School Board, Mr. Fitch, H.M. Inspector of Schools, Mr. Feron, a most distinguished educationist, and lastly the right hon. Gentleman who was a late Minister for Education, the Member for the Dartford Division of Kent. One or two of them went as far as to say that the School Boards should execute the functions for the administration of secondary education. I shall be subject to correction, but I believe that the only gentlemen who gave evidence during that long and exhaustive Commission in favour of the abolition of School Boards were two Members of the Technical Instruction Committee of the Corporation of Manchester, Mr. Alderman Hoy, and Mr. Reynolds, also a member of the Man, chester Technical Instruction Committee. the hon. member for one of the Divisions of Islington, and a member of the Town Council of Derby. Their evidence was in favour of the abolition of the School Boards and substituting for them County Councils or Town Councils. I think myself that the House was entitled to receive from the Ministry of this country some authoritative expression of opinion in favour of the abolition of School Boards before they introduced this Bill, and that they are unable to produce that authority. Why are we asked therefore to agree to their proposal ? I admit that there are many School Boards in the country districts that were defective, but the Act of 1870 provided machinery to meet that difficulty, while the Royal Commission said that districts might be chosen, larger than the School Board areas, but smaller than the county, which could deal with primary, technical, and secondary education. I am no enemy of the County Councils. So far as technical education is concerned, the County Councils have done fairly well, but it is manifestly absurd to suppose that in the area of a large county it is possible for the County Council effectively to discharge the duty of the administration of education. Now, we have had no experience of the manner in which County Councils or Town Councils are able to deal with education, but I think we can draw an inference from their treatment of the question hitherto, that they are calculated to starve education.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Debate stood Adjourned till this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [2nd December], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

(9.0.) MR. ATHERLEY-JONES : I have no doubt, Sir, very many hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to take part in this debate, and therefore I shall endeavour to bring my remarks to a speedy conclusion. I was observing when the sitting was suspended that the tendency of parties elected for general purposes is in the direction of parsimony, and what precedents there are point to the direction that the County Council as a body is likely to restrain expenditure in regard to secondary education. I remember one or two such cases in the Report of the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Secondary Education. A very able gentleman holding a high official position in connection with education in Scotland, stated that prior to the Act of 1872—which established in Scotland the School Board system—the municipalities starved the burgh schools, which are of a similar character to those known in this country as schools for higher education, but that as soon as the 1872 Act came into operation in Scotland they at once saw a great revival in secondary education, due entirely to the encouragement given by the School Boards in contradistinction to that hitherto given by Municipal Councils as regarded such education. Again, take the case of Manchester. From 1890 to 1895 not a single penny was granted out of the rates of Manchester for the encouragement or promotion of technical or secondary education, but I do not forget how in recent years, acting under the great impetus given by popular opinion to secondary education, Manchester has shown her appreciation of the necessity of coming into line with public opinion in regard to it. With regard to the special grant known as the whisky grant, which was made for secondary or technical education, there are numerous instances in which the municipalities chose to apply it to purposes outside such education. At Yarmouth, I believe, a large portion of the grant was voted for the construction of a cricket and football ground. All this goes to show that municipal authorities elected for general purposes are not likely to be generous, but rather parsimonious, with regard to secondary education.

We have been challenged to propound an alternative scheme. I do not see that it is obligatory on the Opposition to do that, but your own educational experts in their evidence before the Royal Commission did propound an alternative scheme. What we say is, leave the School Boards in populous districts alone, in sparsely-populated places consolidate the School Boards, and let secondary education be under a separate authority. I believe that such a system as that would have solved the problem with which we have to deal. It would be easy enough to make a union between that separate authority and those who represent elementary education. One word only on the religious aspect of the question. I am a Churchman myself, and am not therefore actuated by anything like a feeling of bitterness towards the Church of England. I quite agree with what fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University in his extremely moderate speech—that it is not likely that a majority of the clergymen in the 8,000 parishes where there is only one school will be intolerant in their action. But we have to look at the cases where there is an appreciable minority of Nonconformists. What is contended from this side is that we have no right to have two educational systems, one that is practically secular and the other which is denominational. We want one general system of education throughout the schools of the country. If you give us a secular system of education, if you give us control by our local authority, or by imperial authority, over the education of this country, we are quite willing to allow ministers of all denominations to go into the schools and teach the tenets of their particular Churches or religious bodies. I believe that is a solution of the difficulty which the Liberal Party would accept. It is undoubtedly an absurdity that on the strength of possession of the freehold of the schools, denominationalists are to dictate the particular form of religious instruction, while the State is to find the equipment and maintain the schools. We say that these schools are really national schools, and we decline to admit your right to make them spheres of influence for one particular sect in this country. I cannot help deploring that the Government has not recognised this fact. The Bill does, in a considerable measure, admit the principle of popular control, and we believe that, illusory as it is at present, it will be in our power in good time to make those changes which will transform the schools into secular schools, not with the idea of banishing religion, but with the intention of once for all putting an end to that unjust domination of a sect, whether of a majority or minority, over the schools of the country, a domination which undoubtedly hurts the conscience of the great Nonconformist body with which the Liberal Party is historically associated.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): I remember when the controversy about education was raging some four or five years ago, the Prime Minister on more than one occasion declared that if the whole question came up for final settlement, it would be settled on lines which would be wholly agreeable to none of the great parties to the controversy. I think that in this matter the Prime Minister was a true prophet. To offer any criticism on the Bill as it is about to emerge from this House seems a very ungrateful task, when one thinks what the principal author of this Measure has gone through on its account. No one who has not closely followed these debates can realise what this Bill must have meant to the Prime Minister during the earlier part of the session, when opinion had not crystallised on this matter as it now has; the right hon. Gentleman day after day and week after week was exposed to a variety of ingenious attacks from both before and behind. But he fought consistently for the true principles of education and of religious liberty, and I for one am neither unappreciative nor ungrateful. But I must say that the Bil as it emerges is not, and cannot wholly acceptable to many of those who in the past have been most interested in the maintenance and welfare of denominational schools. I firmly believe that this is a good Bill for local government. It sets before those responsible for local government new and greater duties and a new and higher ideal. It is, I believe, a good Bill for the teachers. It gives them a new and better status, and in many cases it will prove of great material as well as civic advantage to them. It is, I believe, a good Bill for the children, because the children in the future will under it get a far better education than they have ever had before. It is a good Bill for education as a whole, because it does really unite all branches of education in one harmonious and equitable system. But it is not altogether a good Bill for the present individual managers of schools.

I am afraid that in this connection I must say a few words upon what is known as the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, and in so doing I should like to guard myself in two respects. In the first instance I have no desire whatever to interfere in any way in any internal differences in the Church of England, and if my hon. friend the Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool should succeed another session in inducing the Prime Minister to bring in a Clergy Discipline Bill I shall take the opportunity for a prolonged indulgence in rural diversions. In the second place I do not wish to argue this question, as it has been largely argued, as a matter between the clergy and laity, which obviously is a matter which must vary enormously as regards different denominations, but I want to express my objection to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment on the solely broad ground that it is a wrongful thing that members of any one denomination should be given a statutory right to interfere with the religious teaching of another. Let me illustrate what I wish to say. In the first place, let me take my own case. Where I live is a small parish, in which I think I may say, without arrogance, I am the principal resident. There is an Anglican school, conducted on Evangelical, or, at any rate, moderate principles, and I pay a voluntary rate for that school without any conscientious objection. Now in that case, if under this Bill six managers have to be found, I think it extremely likely that I may be appointed as one of the two public managers; in fact, I do not see how they can be able to make up the six without asking me. If that is so, I shall certainly do my best with regard to that school in the matter of secular instruction. But supposing some case of religious difficulty should arise, I think it would be absolutely intolerable from the point of view of those who have founded this school that I should have any say in regard to it. Personally, I should be only too glad to run away. But possibly my colleague, the other elected manager, might not take the same view, and in any case it would be open to either of us to do great mischief to the future of the school, and from the point of view of the foundation managers, the latter would have every right to ask us both to stand aside and have nothing to do with matters with which we are in no sense concerned. Take again the case of a Jewish school in the East End of London. It is a matter of common knowledge that the religious views of those members of the Hebrew faith who come from the East of Europe to this country in such large numbers, differ materially on various points from those who have long been domiciled here, and such matters of difference might easily affect the curriculum of a Jewish school. If that were so, and if this Bill were extended to London, is it tolerable that two Christian ratepayers should serve on the management and have a voice in determining that dispute? I have always looked on this Bill as a logical and equitable measure, because it clearly followed the principle of rendering unto Cæsar those things which are Cæsar's, but in this particular instance it seems to me that a raid has been made by the public authority on a domain which is not its own, and I trust that even at the eleventh hour the Prime Minister will not mar the organic unity of a great creation by assenting to a principle that is as illogical in theory as it is irritating in practice.

I now come to another matter, perhaps of less theoretical interest, viz., the burden thrown on the managers of voluntary schools. Several hon. Members have sought to minimise that burden, and he referred to the relief afforded by allownces for endowments fees, and rents of teachers' houses. In each of these matters I think the Government provision to be just. In regard to endowments, it is only right that the wishes of deceased benefactors should be respected, and that the provision they have made for the support of religious schools should accrue to those on whom the burden of religious teaching is to fall in the future. As regards the question of fees, these have been in the past practically a voluntary contribution to the schools, and it is only that the cost of the purposes for which they have been used hitherto should be defrayed out of them in the future. As to teachers' houses, they necessarily form part of the teachers' salaries, which the local authorities are to pay in the future. Passing from these considerations, however, I would ask the attention of the House to the schools which have neither endowments nor teachers' salaries, nor have charged fees. In a great number of these cases the future state of the schools will be worse than it is at present. If it is argued that this Bill affords relief to existing managers, I think, on examination, it will be found that in many cases the objects which were paid for openly and freely from the aid grant in the past, such as providing heating apparatus and asphalting playgrounds, will come on the managers in the future, and will constitute a burden on the denomination which in the past they did not feel. But in the case of a great number of these schools, the pressure which was brought to breaking point in 1897, will be continued at the present time, and no relief will be found by the managers, and no benefit will accrue to the denomination. That, I think, is a most serious disadvantage, and, at any rate, it is a most conclusive argument against what has so often been alleged, that this Bill is an endowment for the use of a particular denomination. I think I may answer for one religious body, which has never surrendered any school to rate competition in the past, and will not surrender any school under the operations of this Bill. But with regard to many other classes of schools, I should wish to believe that those who support them will be equal to the strain, but I confess I am not altogether sanguine. Many managers of these schools will, in the future, have to pay rates where before they did not pay them. They will have to maintain the buildings in repair; and their personal authority and personal pride will receive a damaging blow. I hope, however, that they will not be influenced by such considerations; but I am not sanguine of the result. I have seen it statedthat many managers of Church of England schools are prepared to close these schools owing to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. I would put such managers on the same plane as those who would refuse to pay rates for the purposes of national education. I think for those managers to close their schools, not because they are hurt, but because they may be hurt, would be an unworthy policy; and I confess, if such a policy were adopted by the managers of Church of England Schools, I should be ashamed at the action of my friends.

It has been stated by Members on the other side of the House that there is no general desire in this country for dogmatic teaching. Some hon. Members have gone further, and have said that we ought not to impose dogmatic teaching on young children. I well remember that at the age of 11 years I was taught certain dogmas of a portentous character which have left an indelible mark on my mind ever since. The first of them was that a point is that which has no parts and no magnitude. Another was the whole is greater than its part; and a third was that two straight lines cannot enclose a space. I remember these, and kindred propositions of a like alarming nature; and I was subjected to a series of most tormenting mental exercises—I think they were as many as twenty—before I was allowed to reach the point of proving to demonstration that two sides of a triangle are greater than the third. That fact could have been proved to any child by a practical empirical demonstration; and it might be thought that it would have been better to take a child out into the open air, and to show him that the shortest way from one point to another was in a straight line, without wearying his juvenile brain with a number of mental exercises. I venture to say that if education is to be simplified dogmas of another kind than religious dogmas will have to be wiped off the slate of national education. I will not deny that, at any rate to those who still rejoice in the path of youth, there is something attractive and stimulating in the atmosphere of strife and conflict which attended the debates on the Bill. The countenances of hon. Members opposite were illuminated, and I might almost say etherealised, by the joy of battle. I am not unwilling to take part in a fight when fighting is necessary; but it is pitiable that on this question of education we should have to fight at all. I was greatly struck with the remarks of the hon. Member for Oldham yesterday. I was heartily in agreement with him in many of his propositions; and more especially in what he said as to the profanation of the Sunday by so many of the upper classes; though I confess I draw an inference from that different to the inference drawn by the hon. Member. But I desire most heartily to say that it is a matter of real grief to me that the earnestness and devotion and real religious zeal to be found among many of the opponents of this measure should not be joined to the equally deep religious convictions which we feel on these subjects. There is not too much earnestness in the world at present that we can afford to lose any of it. The danger is not too much zeal but the general atmosphere of indifference around us; and from the bottom of my heart, I wish we could enlist in the same cause of civic growth and religious freedom all that earnestness and sincerity which I fully recognise in many who, on this question, are our strongest opponents. We can only arrive at an eirenicon by a frank recognition of our differences. I welcome especially the remark of the Secretary to the Board of Education yesterday that when these differences are better understood a true working agreement will be more nearly arrived at. In conclusion, I would express my conviction that in this matter peace is only to be had by a recognition on the part of all parties that they must respect the right of every man to interpret for his own children, and in his own way, what I believe is still a national conviction, that the path of civic duty starts only from the fear of God.

(9.38.) MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: The peroration of the hon. Member sets forth exactly what this Bill is not. That shows the danger of preparing a peroration beforehand. As I understand it, what this Bill does is not to allow a parent to say what religious education his child may have. I am not going to follow the hon. Member into reminiscences of his youthful days: I do not quite see how that would be relevant. As I understood the hon. Member, his argument is that the teaching of dogma is as useful as the teaching of Euclid——

MR. JAMES HOPE: What I said was that in Euclid dogmatic principles were involved quite as much as in religious instruction.

*MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: Then I understand that according to the hon. Member religion and Euclid are on the same dogmatic plane. I will do the hon. Member the justice of assuming that his remarks were relevant to the discussion. He said he learned Euclid at 11 years of age, but he now thinks that his youthful learning was a complete failure, and I am bound to say I am inclined to agree with him, because, so far as I am concerned, he has given me no information to enable me to arrive at a contrary conclusion. For obvious reasons I have been a constant listener to this debate during the last two days, and I notice that a great variety of subjects have been touched upon. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University made what I think is technically called by the Attorney General an "amazing" speech. The right hon. Gentleman said that he wished to distinguish fact from fiction; and although he had that laudable object in view, there was hardly ever a speech which confused fact and fiction more successfully than his. He made a quotation from Dr. Clifford. I am not entitled to speak for Dr. Clifford, but I think the right hon. Gentleman, speaking with his authority, ought to have verified that quotation. For my part, I have not the slightest doubt that there is a serious mistake in the version the right hon. Gentleman gave. I think the right hon. Gentleman was confusing fact and fiction to such an extent that he was not entitled to open his speech with the statement that he wished to distinguish between them. This Bill has had a very serious effect on two Leaders in this House. The Irish Leader—we all know what has happened to him. He went home not to return again; but so bitter is this religious controversy, and so powerful is the priesthood in Ireland, that after a letter or two from the bishops, we have the pitiable spectacle of the hon. Member abdicating his position as Leader of an independent Party in Ireland. In Ireland the Leader poses but the priest deposes, and we have the spectacle of the Roman Catholic party in Ireland being now represented by my hon. friend the Member for South Leitrim, who has been constant and faithful amid all the tribulations of the Party to which he belongs. I congratulate him. I do not think the Irish Party have yet elected a Leader—there is plenty of time for the hon. Member. I have no doubt, however, that this Bill will not only serve to unite the Liberal Party, but, curiously enough, to dissever the Irish Party in this House. The real point I wish to submit is this. It seems to me we must accept the principle which was carried on the Second Reading of this Bill, that the denominational system is to be part of the educational system of this country. I am not going to quarrel with that now. Some time ago, in the debates in Committee, I used the word "bargain," and the First Lord of the Treasury strenuously resisted it. I am sure the First Lord of the Treasury will be the first to recognise episcopal authority, and I think I can give him some quotations which will show him that, in the negotiations or dealings in connection with the Bill, the bishops understood that there was a bargain between themselves and the Government. I do not say there was.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There was not.

*Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH: That just shows how bishops can be misled. If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to say so, I congratulate him on having been able to mislead the whole Episcopal Bench, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, or upwards. The bishops were all under the impression that there was a bargain, and how astounded and amazed they will now be to learn that, after all, there was nothing like a bargain, and that the right hon. Gentleman, having listened to their views, went his own way unheeding their protests. The Bishop of London, who has taken a very prominent part in this controversy, speaking as lately as November 4th, said that "they offered the State property worth £750,000 a year, while the cost of their own special denominational teaching was only £175,000 a year," and he added, "That is the weak part of the bargain." There was no bargain, of course. There was only a supposed bargain. It was an episcopal delusion. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich would not, of course, be a party to anything so sordid and commercial as a bargain. It would not appeal to his ecclesiastical mind; but the noble Lord said that it was proper for the State to give a *quid pro quo* in exchange for the school buildings. The school buildings were the *quo*, and we know where the "quids" are to come from. The Archbishop himself—I really thought there was some sort of divinity that hedged an archbishop against mistakes of this kind—said he thought that the Bill drove rather a hard bargain with the Church in some respects. I feel sorry for the Archbishop, but I am bound to accept the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury implicitly that there was no bargain. I think the Church was well within its right in thinking that it ought to be consulted before a Bill of this kind was introduced. It is very interesting to look at coincidences, although they may not prove anything. Convocation met some time before the Bill was introduced, and said that they were willing to meet the Government by allowing one-third of the managers to be outside the Church. By a marvellous coincidence, in this Bill one-third of the managers are outside the Church; but there was no bargaining, of course—no cause and effect. It was simply the view of Convocation and of the right hon. Gentleman, and they agreed upon it; but there was no bargain. Quite frankly, I look upon the position of the First Lord of the Treasury as holding the balance fairly and evenly between the Church and the State in this transaction. He is the arbitrator between the State on the one side and the denominations on the other, who was to settle the terms of partnership between them in carrying on the work of education. The principle which ought to have guided the right hon. Gentleman was to regulate public and private control in the proportion of public and private expenditure. I think that is a fair way of putting the case to the House. The Church gives something, and the State gives something; and it was for the Prime Minister in this supposed bargain to see that the interests of the State were not sacrificed to the interests of the sects or the interests of the priests. The matter we have to determine is a very simple one. We have to ask what does the Church contribute towards the elementary education of this country. It gives the school buildings rent free. There is considerable dispute as to the value of these buildings. In the report of the National Society it is stated that the sum spent on these buildings was fourteen millions odd sterling, say fifteen millions. The right hon. Gentleman in one of his speeches put the value at twenty-six millions. I will divide the difference, and put the figure at twenty millions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman says that the National Society put their buildings at fifteen millions; but when I talked of twenty-six millions —I confess I have not closely investigated the matter myself—I was referring to all the elementary schools in the country.

*MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: I am dealing only with Church of England schools; and I think I am putting it fairly when I say that their capital value is not more than twenty millions, or, at 3 per cent., £600,000 a year. Therefore, the contribution of the Church of England to education per annum amounts to that figure. That is not all. There are the repairs. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University made a most amazing statement on this subject. He said, on the authority of the Bishop of London, that the cost of repairs would amount to 5s. per head per annum for the 3,000,000 children for whom the Church schools had accommodation. Surely there must be some mistake about that. It is perfectly ridiculous The Bishop of London said that they offered to the State property worth £750,000, and that the cost of their denominational teaching was £175,000 a year. I think the Bishop meant that the repairs would come to £175,000 a year.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): That £175,000 is arrived at by taking the proportion of the time in a week devoted to religious teaching of a purely denominational character.

*MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: That is a very dangerous principle for the Bishop to go on. We will see how far the schools are occupied for religious and how far for educational purposes. Anyway, the figure is somewhere between £150,000 and £175,000. It is now common ground that in the course of the progress of this Bill the clergy have had concessions made to them to enable them to meet this claim upon them. They have had the rents of the teachers' houses, amounting to £70,000 or £80,000 a year; half the endowments, £60,000, and half the fees, £60,000, making in all £200,000 a year, which is at any rate sufficient to meet the cost of repairs. Therefore we again come back to this, that the Church contribution for education is £600,000 a year. There is only one other subject to be considered: What is the State contribution? Last year there was spent in the voluntary schools of the Church of England £4,399,000. If you level up these voluntary schools to the level of the board schools, which I understand is the real object of the Bill—and a very good object it is—that would mean the difference between £3 0s. 2d., the cost per child in board schools, and £2 6s. 8d., the corresponding cost in voluntary schools, or a matter of 13s. 6d. per child. Multiply that 13s. 6d. by the 2,000,000 children educated in Church of England schools, and you have £1,350,000, making in all nearly £6,000,000. Therefore, the Church, on the one hand, gives £600,000, while the State, on the other, gives £6,000,000 —that is, they give towards education in the proportion of ten to one. I submit this as a really serious argument against the Bill. How in the world the proportion of two-thirds of the management has been arrived at I do not know, unless it is that it gives a convenient majority by which the Church may have the practical control of the schools.

We have been told that "the Church stepped in," and the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Honiton Division, yesterday compared the state of education in this country with the position of Egypt before the intervention of England. We are not rewarding the Church for the past; we have to look at her present contribution. But what more does she get? She gets relief from subscriptions, and nearly £3,380,000 a year in salaries for positions held in the main by Churchmen and Churchwomen. Is not that a splendid contribution to the Church? Only Churchmen need apply for these posts. The Church gives £600,000 on the one hand, and gets posts worth over £3,000,000 a year for her own adherents. Can anybody be surprised that we say, and say truly, that this Bill is practically an endowment of wealth, influence, and patronage for the Church of England? Can there be any question at all as to this clerical control in the schools? The clergyman, under the schedule, is *ex officio* chairman of the board of managers; he has a vote not only as a member, but also as chairman. Is not this clerical control? On 24th March the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education said—

> "I desire to insist strenuously that by religious teaching I do not mean clerical control."

If you do not mean clerical control, why do you make clerical control a part of the Bill? I do not think the Prime Minister was much intimidated by the Albert Hall meeting; at any rate, he did not change the Bill; but I do think it had a little influence on the mind of the Attorney General. I am not going to say a word against the hon. and learned Member; he has often splendidly vindicated the profession of which I myself am a humble member. Perhaps I ought not to say that that meeting had any influence on his mind, but I think it had a little influence on his industry. As a result of the Albert Hall meeting he applied himself with industry and energy to the consideration of this Kenyon-Slaney Clause to see what it really did mean, and, merely as a coincidence, he discovered there was a great deal more in it than he had ever suspected. Another coincidence was that it happened to accord in the main with the views of the Albert Hall meeting. I do not put it any higher than that. I say that clerical control is of the very essence of this Bill. Although not so intended, there can be no doubt that the Bill does in fact mean clerical control. We are told that in another place steps will be taken to make the Kenyon-Slaney Clause mean what the Attorney General says it does mean. That will be a very important Amendment, for it will certainly require a number of words to make it mean all that the Attorney-General means. The other night the hon. Baronet representing the Irish Party appealed to the House of Lords for all it was worth against this Clause. I think the Irish Party have come to a pretty pass when they have to appeal to the House of Lords.

There is one other point I wish to submit to the Prime Minister. I may be very sanguine, but I believe it to be a new point. As I understand it, the basis of the claim of the Church of England to special and separate treatment is that she gives the schools rent-free. But the Church is not the only donor of school buildings. Clause 19, sub-Section (2), provides for School Board areas where there are already School Boards, and it says that the county authority may impose upon the School Board area a proportion between one-half and three-fourths of the capital cost. Therefore the School Board area gives you one-half or three-fourths of a school, just as the Church gives you a whole school in another place. Halfway between one-half and three-fourths is five-eighths, so that the Government say to the School Board areas, "In future you must give five-eighths of a school to the local authority free of charge." The Church for its whole school gets two-thirds of the management, but the School Board area for its five-eighths gets nothing. What does the five-eighths mean? Every year the repayment of principal in these areas comes to £835,519; interest on capital, £1,045,568, making a total of £1,881,087. Five-eighths of that is £1,200,000, so that really the School Board areas will contribute to education £1,200,000 a year, while the Church gives £600,000. To put it in another way, the outstanding capital due in respect of school buildings is £32,000,000. Five-eighths of that is £20,000,000. Is not this really an almost irresistible argument? Here the Church, with its £600,000, gets four-sixths of the management, while the School Boards areas, giving twice the amount as donors of schools, get nothing, and even on the public authority they get only one-third. Why do you not give them, as donors of schools, something in proportion to that given to the Church?

The Bishop of London the other day said the undenominational system of teaching was a "rotten system." Those are strong words for a Bishop to use; there is not that refinement or that ecclesiastical flavour about them which refined and sensitive people would expect from a Bishop, even when dealing with education. But if it is such a rotten system it is very peculiar that clergymen should have been so anxious to get on the School Boards; I should have thought they would be contaminated by contact with such an unsavoury system. My complaint against the Government is that in rebuilding the educational system of the country they have abolished the better part, and taken the worse as a foundation on which to build. Reference has been made to the way in which the Bill will be met in the country. I think hon. Members opposite are mistaken if they think the matter will be over tonight, or even after the House of Lords have passed the Bill. There are men with conscientious objections. People may laugh about conscientious objections, but the Government have provided for them in regard to vaccination, and surely they could have provided for them in this Bill. I have great sympathy with the people who take a strong view upon this matter, and, as I have said outside the House, there are two stages of resistance to the Measure. Now, we furnish you with arguments; later, the people will argue you with furniture. The point we are discusissing whether it is fair and just treatment, and my complaint against the Prime Minister is that he has not held the balance evenly between the Church and the State, that he has given too many favours and advantages to the Church, and too few to the State and to the people, as regards whom he stands in the position of trustee. For my part, I had the pleasure of voting against the first and second readings of the Bill, and tonight I hope for the third time to record my vote in the same Lobby.

* (10.15.) MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): I desire to say a few words in support of the Third Reading of this Bill, and I think I shall be the more readily excused when it is remembered that no other Scottish Member has spoken on this side of the House. Several have taken part in the debate from the other side, including two or three on the front Bench, but I think that my remarks will represent a larger section of Scottish opinion than those which have come from the other side. Many of us have not gone into the minute and insignificant points raised in the debates, but we really understand its main scope and principles, and to those I shall confine my remarks.

In the first place, the Government are entitled to credit from the Opposition for having entered on this education question with the greatest honesty of purpose and in a non-party spirit. The Bill for the education of children in Scotland, introduced by the hon. and gallant Member for North Aberdeen, would never have become law but for the support of the Government and Members on this side, and exactly the same may be said of the corresponding Bill for England, the good genius in the latter case being the late Vice-President of the Council. The Government has taken up the present matter in the same spirit, and the result is the admirable Measure now before the House. In addition to the intrinsic merits of the Measure, we must take into consideration the fact that the Anglican Church comprises about 70 per cent. of the population. ("No, No!") I think I am quite within the mark in making that statement, and that the Bill would be supported by about three-fourths of the people. I know objections have been raised to such statistics in view of the results of recent elections, but those elections are the natural swing of the pendulum, and the pendulum will swing back again.

The constituencies, more especially in Scotland and Ireland, should take into account this preponderating majority in favour of the Education Bill. I believe that if this Measure were to be submitted to the people as a distinct issue it would be supported by at least three-fourths of the people of this country. The Bill has not only the support of the great bulk of the population, but I believe it will facilitate the progress of education in this country. We must take into account the progress made by the children of England in the past in elementary education, which during the last thirty years has been relatively greater than in any other country in Europe. All honour to the educationists who have contributed to this result. In the year 1870 the children of England were very much inferior to the children of Scotland, but now they have been brought up very nearly to the same level. A great deal of the progress which has been made in the past is due to denominational schools in which the majority of the children have been educated. I believe this Bill will greatly accelerate this progress and will very much improve primary education, and in lesser degree higher education. It will increase the resources of voluntary schools and will add to the amount of popular control over them. And last, but not least, it will encourage a systematic religious instruction in those schools. The great majority of the people of England have wisely determined that systematic religious instruction shall form a part of elementary education.

The majority of the people in favour of systematic religious instruction includes not only almost the whole of the Churchmen, but also a very large proportion of Nonconformists. These Nonconformists hold the views which were so well expressed for them by the great Nonconformist divine, Dr. Parker, the late able and eloquent pastor of the City Temple Church, who said that "all religious instruction must be sectarian, not in the narrow sense of bigotry, but in the philosophic sense of definition. This view is held by a very large proportion of the Nonconformist people. During the last thirty years there has been the most determined effort on the part of Churchmen and a large number of Nonconformists to maintain systematic religious instruction in the schools. These efforts have been carried on at a great sacrifice. In the very poor diocese presided over by the Bishop of Rochester over £500 per week is being contributed for this purpose. Since the year 1860 the English Church has contributed £50,000,000 sterling, of which £20,000,000 has been invested in the schools the use of which is now being granted to the nation free of cost. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen asked what evidence is there that the people of England want denominational instruction? What better evidence can you have of this than the liberal payment and the great sacrifices which Churchmen have made for the support of these denominational schools?

This contest has hitherto been waged under very unequal conditions—the denominationalists in many cases having had to pay rates besides supporting their own Schools. Fortunately the majority of the people of England have, by their liberality and determined effort, preserved systematic religious teaching in their schools, and it is well for England that they have done this. Had it been otherwise I believe the moral condition of England, upon which our prosperity in the future must depend, would have been on a much lower level. These efforts are now about to be crowned with permanent and well-deserved success by this Bill which will also confer enormous advantages upon primary education, and to a lesser extent on higher education. In conclusion, let me express the earnest hope that all Nonconformists, many of whom have so stoutly and ably opposed this Bill, and a few of whom outside this House have expressed their intention of doing everything they can to render it inoperative, will consider that the future education of the children of England and a very great deal of the future prosperity of the whole of the people of England are bound up in the successful working of this Bill, and will set themselves resolutely to make it a success, as the Scottish people did thirty years ago. There are thousands and tens of thousands of Churchmen, broad-minded, open-handed, and self-sacrificing, who have done splendid work for the Church in the past, and who are still willing to work for the Church in the future. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen said that the religious controversy now smouldering under this Bill would leap up into a flame, but I believe that, if entered upon in a common sense, not to speak of a Christian spirit, its success, even in its first two or three years, in advancing education will be so great that hon. Members opposite will wonder why they opposed it. I have very great pleasure in supporting the Third Reading of this Bill.

*(10.30.) MR. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): If I ask the indulgence of the House for a very few moments—and I promise to be extremely brief—it is not with the belief or in the hope that, as far as the

general principles, as distinguished from the detailed provisions of the Bill, are concerned—and it is with general principles only we have to deal on an occasion like this—it will be possible at this stage of the debate to contribute a new idea, or even a new phrase, to the discussion. If that is to be done, it must be done elsewhere. Possibly, it may be done in another place, where we hear that to-morrow night the ardent spirits who have been waiting so long for this Bill will at last be confronted with what will seem to them, at any rate, to be the fresh and many-sided attractions of a virgin subject. We have spent so many months in almost daily companionship with it that, although our feelings, whether of love or aversion, are, I imagine, unchanged, we should be more than human if we could any longer use the vocabulary of passion; and I shall adopt that subdued and sober tone which is appropriate to a valedictory occasion. If we on this side of the House—and I believe I speak for the whole of the Liberal Party—could honestly think that the effect of passing this Bill into law would be to raise the standard of education, or to get rid of administrative friction and waste, I venture to say that we should not only be ready, but eager and anxious, to shut our eyes to many of its blots, and to swallow much in it that would otherwise be unpalatable.

But that is just what we cannot bring ourselves to believe. It appears to us that for every anomaly which this Bill removes it creates another, and that for the additional assistance—which I myself agree to be much needed—which it gives at the public cost to national education, it exacts from the public in the sacrifice both of principle and practical efficiency an unreasonable and unjustifiable price. I will confine myself to two or, at the outside, three points which appear to me to be of capital importance in order to make good and illustrate the proposition I have laid down. And first of all as regards the new authority, or rather the new family of authorities, which this Bill is going to call into existence. I adhere to the opinion which I expressed at the very earliest stage of our debates, that it is a blunder of the first magnitude to disestablish the great School Boards of this country. We are fully alive to the defects, and they are many, of our existing School Board system. The effect of the cumulative vote is to make the School Board in many places an imperfectly representative institution. Over considerable tracts of the country, from the smallness or from the sparseness of population of the parochial areas, and the consequent poverty of resources, both in men and in money, the School Board is an inefficient educational instrument.

The Cockerton judgment again, by lopping off the whole of the continuation work, and by making it unsafe to give instruction in elementary schools to children over fifteen years of age, has largely mutilated and paralysed some of their best activities. And, finally, with a view to the proper relationship of elementary and higher education, I do not believe there is anybody among the opponents of this Bill on this side who does not agree that it is urgently necessary that you should secure a real simplification and co-ordination—which, I beg the House to observe, is a totally different thing from an artificial unification—both of authorities and of functions. All those defects might have been remedied, all those necessities, great and urgent as they are, might have been met, without this wholesale and indiscriminate massacre. By a better arrangement and distribution of areas, by leaving the great School Boards intact, by establishing not a mere *modus vivendi*, but what might easily have been brought into shape, a real concordat between the School Boards on the one side and the municipalities on the other, and above all by having regard to the infinite variety of local conditions as between different parts of the country and not endeavouring to stereotype a cast-iron and uniform system on the nation—by following lines like these you would have found yourselves on the road to a national solution of the problem of education.

I can say for all of us that we have no enmity whatsoever to the educational ambitions, and we have no desire to narrow the educational province, of these great municipal councils. But by casting on them in name and ostensibly the whole burden of elementary education you are thrusting upon their shoulders functions, for which they have shown no desire whatsoever, and which your own scheme shows you distrust their competence to discharge.

Otherwise we should never have heard of this hybrid committee, which from the very necessities of the case—at any rate, in a large majority of instances—will be, as between itself and the County Council in all matters of elementary education, practically autonomous. What will be the result? I am looking at the matter, I beg the House to observe, entirely and exclusively from an educational point of view. In the first instance, you will have put an end to the existence of the best, the most fruitful, and the most beneficent educational agencies that at present exist in this country; and you will leave the members of those agencies, the old School Boards. men and women who have equipped themselves, in many cases by years of training and devoted and strenuous activity, and have thereby acquired special aptitude which you will find in no other class of local administrators, for educational work—you will leave them to the precarious chance of being nominated or co-opted on this hybrid committee, or appointed to the subordinate rank of managers.

What are you going to put in the place of the agency which you propose to destroy? Even at this the eleventh hour I must once more summarise the extraordinary arrangement which the Government propose in the name of unification and popular control. You will have in the first place nominally in front, where the School Board used to be, the County Council or the Town Council—a body which, as my hon. friend the member for Carnarvon showed in his brilliant speech—has its hands already full with its more appropriate work, and which, if it is to do its duty to its constituents in regard to its primary functions as a municipal authority, will only be able to give a very slight and perfunctory attention to the work of education. Everybody agrees that the County Councils and the Town Councils cannot do the work of the School Boards. Next you have got a committee, an imperfectly representative body, and a body upon which you have been careful to provide for the representation of the non-provided schools—a committee which in a county of any considerable area, inhabited by a large population and with difficulties of communication between its different parts, will be absolutely unable to exercise effective superintendence and control over the fortunes and management of individual schools. Lastly, you have got, as regards the non-provided schools, a board of management which in no true sense of the term is representative at all, with the power of appointing and dismissing teachers, with no responsibility to the ratepayers of the parish or the county, in daily contact with the actual work of the school, and, according to all past experience, certain to become in time practically supreme. In other words, you put in place of the School Boards a system which has neither administrative unity, educational efficiency, nor popular responsibility.

Now I pass to my next point, and I am still looking at the matter entirely from an educational point of view. If we are to have a really efficient system of elementary education in this country, there are two fundamental conditions. The first is that the administrative authority should be, as I have shown your authority is not going to be, at once competent, representative, and responsible, and in the next place those who do the actual work of instruction—the teaching profession—must be the best equipped and placed in a position to make the most of their abilities and career which it is possible for Parliament to secure. These two things—a good administrative body on the one hand, and, on the other, a teaching profession for which there is an open career—that is to say, a profession in which capacity and character can make their way and obtain their reward—these are the pivots on which will hinge the entire future education of the children. I have shown how you have done with one—the administrative body. Let us see how you are dealing with the teachers. I am not speaking of them as a trades union or a class, but of the grievances of the teaching profession looked at from the point of view of the public. In the first place, you have in the denominational schools teachers of inferior *status*, of inadequate numbers, and with insufficient pay, and, in the next place, you have what is a still more formidable obstacle to the efficiency of the profession—the practical exclusion from a vast number, indeed, I may say the majority, of the rural schools, if not from the profession, at any rate from all except its lowest ranks, of the whole of the Nonconformist children. How has the Government dealt with this matter? I agree that the Government have done a great deal to improve the status and remuneration of the denominational teachers. But just in proportion as they have placed teachers in these denominational schools upon the same level, in point of remuneration and professional prospects, with the teachers in what used to be called the board schools, just to that extent have they multiplied and intensified the grievances of the Nonconformist child who desires to become a teacher. It is no exaggeration to say that from the very time at which this Bill passes into law, the teaching profession becomes as much and as truly a branch of the Civil Service as any one of those branches for which we vote estimates every year. And when you have converted the teaching profession into a branch of the Civil Service, how are you going to defend, in view of the sense of justice, equity, and equality which has always characterised our policy and legislation with regard to our public service, the complete exclusion from the higher prizes of that profession in the denominational schools of a vast number of the most talented of those who belong to that profession? I say that is not only unjust to the teachers, not only in total violation of all our best traditions and practice, but looking at it from the point of view of the children, and the point of view of the efficient education to be given, you are deliberately impoverishing the resources of the country.

I pass now to the last stage of my argument. I have shown, I think the two great blots, from the educational point of view, of this proposed settlement. They are both due to the same thing—to the interests or the supposed interests of the denominational system. There are many ways—there are right ways and there are wrong ways—of dealing with the denominational system, but of all the ways you could possibly have selected, in my humble judgment this is the very worst. When I speak of the denominational system I am supposing you are going deliberately to retain the power of giving denominational instruction in State-aided schools. I am not going to discuss the abstract question of the best system of education. As my hon. friend pointed out earlier in the evening, there are two systems actually at work at this moment within the British Empire, both of which can be tested by results—namely, the Scotch system, under which it rests with the School Board to give or to withhold denominational instruction as it pleases, and the Colonial system under which facilities are given at the wish of the parents for denominational instruction. Both these systems have on the whole worked well, but neither could stand for a day without the principle of popular control. That is the principle to which you have deliberately given the go-by in this novel experiment, which I venture to predict with the utmost confidence is, in the long run, doomed to failure. I say, with as much certainty as one can hazard in a prediction of the future in a matter of this kind, to the Government and to hon. Gentlemen opposite who have supported this Bill that in my judgment this Bill will prove the severest blow which the denominational system in this country has ever received, because it associates with the maintenance of that system, in the minds of large numbers if not of the majority of the people of this country, the denial of the fundamental conditions of justice and equity.

We have already travelled a long way from the principles of the Act of 1870. It is quite true that what Mr. Forster contemplated was to allow to co-exist side by side the so-called voluntary schools, and the schools managed by School Boards; but what was the fundamental basis of that arrangement? Why! that which was to be the criteria, the differentia, of the voluntary schools was that they were to put down on the table an equivalent to the contributions given by the State. Step by step the equivalent contribution has been eaten away, and when this Bill is passed into law it will have completely disappeared in the limbo of the past. The present Archbishop of Canterbury has said many wise things on the subject of education, but never did he say a wiser or more statesmanlike thing than when, a few years ago, he warned his fellow Churchmen and the supporters of denominational schools in this country that if they wanted to keep the control of their schools they must pay for them, and that if once they ceased their efforts and sacrifices the management must be transferred to the hands of the public, who would be responsible for the cost and the manner in which the money is expended.

How do we stand under this Bill? We all know how it works out. Practically it comes to this—that the cost of the fabric and of repairs will be the only contribution made by the voluntary school managers, and we all know that the burden of repairs will be more than compensated for by the various pickings which, in the course of the Committee stage of this Bill, have been secured by the denominational managers. How will that strike the public? Because in the long run the stability of this system will depend on the way in which it conforms to the judgment of the people. They will see the slender remains of the old contributions, and they will see, on the other hand, the predominance in the management of those to whom it is to be entrusted. They will contrast the proportions and choice contribution and control, and this will give rise to a constantly growing sense of injustice. As my hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon has pointed out, it will introduce a new, a disturbing, and a most baneful factor into the whole of municipal life, and, what is worse, it will divert the stream of educational zeal into the shallow and muddy channels of ecclesiastical and sectarian controversy.

There is one other aspect of the future of the denominational system which I should like to commend to the earnest attention of hon. Gentlemen who are going to vote for this Bill. I refer to the Clause which now goes by the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Shropshire. Before I state what I think will be the clear effect of that Clause, may I point out that its history and the situation in which we are now placed constitutes one of the most curious performances in the legislative annals even of this House. We have been asked by the Government to pass this Bill tonight. We may never see it again, and I devoutly hope myself that we never shall see it again. At any rate, we are asked to part with it tonight, though it contains provisions as to the importance of which we are all agreed, but as to the meaning of which we are all at sixes and sevens. Is there a single man in this House from the Prime Minister downwards who has at this moment an assured conviction as to what is the meaning of this Clause or as to what interpretation will be put upon it if it reaches the gates of a court of law? Parliament has often by inadvertence put obscure and ambiguous provisions on the Statute-Book, but this is the first time that we have been invited by the Government of the day deliberately to pass into law an enactment which admittedly is not an intelligible guide to those who have to administer the law, but is a series of complicated conundrums for interpretation by the courts. The Attorney General told us tonight that the Government contemplates amending this Clause, and I am not surprised at this somewhat belated announcement. The process is to be carried out in another place. So long as this Bill is here we are responsible for it. The Prime Minister the other night made himself and the House merry on this subject at the expense of a humble, and, I hope, meritorious, although imperfectly appreciated, profession, which some of us are driven by the necessities of life to earn or attempt to earn our daily bread. The Attorney General, although I am afraid the Attorney General is in this matter a somewhat suspected witness, vindicated the disinterestedness of the profession of which he is the distinguished head in language which I am sure went to the heart of every lawyer in this House. But unfortunately in this matter I am afraid we must look to the language of the Prime Minister; and he disposed of the diversity of opinion that had been expressed in reference to the Kenyon-Slaney Clause with the easy observation that he had commonly found that political lawyers expressed the opinions which happened to correspond with those of the party to which they belonged. [An HON. MEMBER: "How very shocking."] It is very shocking; but political lawyers are, I think it is worth remembering, not the only class in this House whose expressed views have a tendency to coincide with party exigencies. I have observed of late years when an hon. Gentleman opposite sitting behind the Treasury Bench has indulged himself in the perilous luxury of uttering views not altogether in harmony with those for the moment in fashion on that Bench, no one has been more swift to mark the iniquity or to chastise the offender than the Prime Minister himself. For this purpose, if I may do so argumentatively—I should be sorry to do it in any other way—I will make the Prime Minister a present of all the lawyers on both sides of the House. Let us suppose—if the Prime Minister's imagination is equal to the task—let us suppose them swept out of Parliamentary existence. Let us suppose that you are repeating the experiment made by our ancestors in days gone by of summoning a House of Commons, a *Parliamentum indoctum*, from which are excluded all lawyers, and of which Lord Coke—like the Attorney General, not altogether an impartial witness—said that the whole of its legislation was not worth twopence. Yet even in that purged and idealised Parliament, which, I am sure, would commend itself to the taste of the Prime Minister, the question would still arise, What is the meaning of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause? I am afraid that is a digression, but I will venture to say to the House this—and that is why I make an appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are supporters of this denominational system—whatever else the Kenyon-Slaney Clause may do or not do, it clearly does two things. In the first place, it affects in the most vital and trenchant manner the provisions of the trust deeds of every denominational school in this country. I agree that it is not the only Clause in the Bill that does so, but it is the most striking of them, and for my part I hold it—and I hope hon. Gentlemen understand the full intent of the vote they are going to give—as an assertion of the title of Parliament to treat those schools as State schools, and upon that footing to abrogate or remould any provisions of the trust in the interests of the public. That, at any rate, is one effect of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause. There is one other thing it does. It gets rid finally of the notion—even if it is going to be amended in the sense in which the Attorney General has interpreted it—that the parish priest is the supreme or only authorised religious teacher in the school of the parish, for if there is anything clear about the construction and the operation of that Clause it is this—that it is in the power of a lay board of managers to lock the clergyman out of the school, and to prevent him from giving any religious teaching in it at all. [Cries of "Oh."] It is one of the points on which lawyers disagree. I am only giving the construction of the Clause which the Attorney General himself gave.

What is the sum of the whole matter? This Bill, which is intended to keep alive the denominational system and to place it on a more sure foundation, may probably turn out to have the exactly opposite effect. You may say in that case, Why do you vote against it? My answer is a very simple one. I am not going to support a measure which I think educationally unsound and politically unjust, because the very evils which it brings about may become so intolerable to the nation that they will work their own cure. No, Sir; I oppose this Bill on a totally different ground. It is because this is a Bill which unsettles a great deal, while it settles nothing; a Bill which destroys much that is good as well as some things that are evil; a Bill which flies in the face of the principles of popular government; a Bill which is leavened throughout, as we believe, with the spirit of inequality and injustice—in the interests of education, which I agree is the first, the greatest, and the most capital of all the interests of the nation—in the interests of education, we claim that it is unworthy of the acceptance of the House of Commons.

(11.8.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is with almost pathetic interest that I make my last speech upon a Bill on which I fear I have wearied this House—[Cries of "No, no"]—in Committee and for eight months of hard fighting in all its stages. The House itself has almost become weary of this endless discussion, and though the right hon. Gentleman has had the satisfaction of addressing a full and interested audience—even he, who I think has not listened to the whole of this debate on the Third Reading—even he must be aware that during the long hours of yesterday and most of the hours of today speeches of great interest and great eloquence have been addressed to audiences very sparse and entirely composed of rival orators. But, Sir, our long labours have come to an end, or have nearly come to an end, and I suppose it is my duty, I will not say to sum up an eight months debate, but, at all events, to utter a few valedictory words on the Bill which has so long occupied our time, and which is, for good or evil, I hope and believe entirely for good, but for good or for evil—without prejudging that point—to have so great an effect upon the education of this country. No, Sir, it is not denied by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, it has not been denied, so far as I know, by any speaker at any stage of this debate, that an Education Bill was a primary necessity. There have been speakers—I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen was one of them—who seemed to think that all the necessities of the case would have been met had we brought in a Secondary Education Bill, which, I admit would, as compared with the present Bill, have been relatively an uncontentious measure. But I am perfectly certain that no real educational reformer in this House or out of this House would think that the education of this country could by any possibility be brought into a condition which would be creditable to the nation, or which would have enabled us to compare our educational condition with that of our great friends and rivals on the Continent and in America, unless the Education Bill to be dealt with was one which gave a combined treatment, not merely of primary, but of secondary education also. I do not stop to argue the point, because really it is unarguable. If your object is to co-ordinate education, if your object is to give what my learned friend described tonight as an educational system which will enable a boy of talent or of genius to rise from stage to stage of education until he can make the best of his abilities for himself and his country, why then it is perfectly clear that to deal with secondary education as distinct from primary education, was to ignore the very elements of the problem with which you had to deal. Then, we had to deal with the whole country; and I can assure hon. Gentlemen that we did not enter into this great controversy without anxious and even painful forecasts of the difficulty which any Ministry bold enough to deal with this great problem must necessarily have regard to. We had presented to us, in the first place, a vast body of vested interests. We had great educational interests; we had great religious interests; we had great local government interests — School Boards, Town Councils, all the great machinery of local government. They were all touched, they were all affected. Each in turn was prepared to find in this Bill some great danger to a cherished desire or a cherished policy. And certainly, Sir, nobody who has had the advantage for seven months of a free and uninterrupted correspondence by post with the clergy of all denominations is likely to minimise the difficulties with which any educational reformer in this country has to deal.

Well, then, Sir, if it be admitted, as I think it must be admitted, that a great reform had to be undertaken, what is the objection that is raised to the particular plan which has been proposed by the Government? For we must recollect that all these things are comparative. We may not possibly have devised the best scheme in existence; but I have listened to these debates month after month and I have failed to find, to put it crudely, what rival plan was in the market which could for one moment be compared with the scheme which we have introduced. Recollect that everybody admits that the existing scheme or system of education is rotten. Everybody admits that it is incoherent and antiquated, bad and ineffective—that it is open to every species of criticism to which antiquated machinery is open.

Well, what are the alternatives? I have listened, as I have just said, in vain to learn from any quarter what the other alternatives are. But do not let me be misunderstood in this matter. I understood the hon. Member for Oldham, who spoke yesterday, went the length of saying that it was unconstitutional to ask the Opposition for an alternative plan. I do not think that it violates any recognised principle of the constitution to ask the Opposition whether they have got a plan dealing with a notorious difficulty; but I quite agree with those who say on the other side that it is not their business to find an educational plan. But then, it is unfair to criticise our plan as it has been criticised unless they can show that our plan is worse than the existing system or that it is not a great improvement on their plan—if they have anything whatever to show. If they have a beautiful scheme, harmonious in all its parts, coherent, logical, which will commend itself to my noble friend below the Gangway and to Dr. Clifford and the country—if they have a plan which settles the religious difficulty and harmonises the whole of English society with regard to it—if they have this one coherent, unexceptional plan for dealing with education in all its branches, then let us hear of it. But I have heard no adumbration of any such scheme whatever. One hon. Gentleman said that you are murdering the School Boards ; that you are committing an educational atrocity in destroying bodies which have done such admirable work. We hear, indeed, I think from the Member for West Monmouth, of a scheme of universal School Boards. Very good. But are you going to propose, if you were in office, a scheme of universal School Boards all over the whole country for counties and for boroughs? And if you proposed it, would you carry it? The idea of trying to have a system of national education covering primary and secondary education all over the country districts is really grotesque. Recollect that we have been listening to Gentlemen opposite for eight months, firing their tirades for what they are worth, and we have not had a chance of retaliating. If we had—I will not say eight months, but eight weeks—I should like to have had the chance of criticising any scheme sketched out from the other side and one which would give us a great reform of our education system. And that is only on purely educational lines, leaving out the religious-side altogether. There is the side, as we all know, of the real difficulty. If there was no religious resistance, no question of religion in the country, I believe the present Bill would have been passed without a division on the Second Reading and carried through the Committee in a week. There is the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs, who through these debates has played, in my judgment, a most distinguished part, though I confess I wish he had left unsaid, even from his own point of view, a great many things which he sometimes said. If he had omitted a certain class of observations I think he would have greatly gained in authority inside and outside the House. I believe that in the opinion of both sides of the House and of the country that the hon. Gentleman has shown himself to be an eminent Parliamentarian. What does he suggest? What does he say about this Bill? He says that the scheme is the worst scheme you can imagine. There are two schemes, he says, both of which he would have greatly preferred to that before the House. One is the "facility" scheme, supported by the hon. Member for Tonbridge and the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, and the other is the Scotch scheme, and either of these schemes, he said, is incomparably better than the plan of this Bill in dealing with the religious difficulty. But, after all, the hon. Gentleman and the House must know perfectly well that either of these plans, whatever their abstract merits may be, are really not practical. About the Scotch plan—or, to put it in language more intelligible to an English audience, about the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause plan——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: And the universal School Boards plan.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: To that plan you have, I venture to say, two great objections. With all its merits—and I am the last to deny that it works extremely well in my country—it has two immense objections to its adoption in this country. In the first place, you could never carry it. The hon. Member for Carnarvon seems to think that he and his friends are in favour of it. I challenge any one to look through all the controversial speeches and pamphlets issued against this Bill during the great campaign carried on during the Autumn months by the militant Nonconformist bodies, and to find a single sentence or hint that those great Nonconformist bodies would have accepted the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause. I make that challenge with absolute confidence. You will not find it. That is one objection. The other is an objection which the hon. Member for Carnarvon would be the first to admit, because he dwelt upon it himself. The hon. Member said that one objection to this Bill was that it would introduce into every Borough and County Council religious difficulties and controversies about denominational formulæ. I hope that the Bill will not have that effect. It has been carefully and deliberately framed to avoid that disastrous result. But with the present division of religious opinion in England, what would be the result of adopting the Scotch system here? We should have plunged into the very evils which the hon. Member describes; and in every Town and County Council we should have had the question raised whether you were to support denominational teaching out of the rates; and, if so, what denominational teaching. The idea that religious peace and harmony is thus to be reached in England, as England is now divided into this infinite variety of sects, many of them quarrelling, as I think, over very secondary matters—but still quarrelling—the idea that religious peace is to be so arrived at is quite illusory.

I hope the House will see what I am coming to. If this Bill is bad, it is bad in comparison with the existing system, or else in comparison with some other system proposed. No other system is proposed, and I am therefore reduced to asking, and asking alone, whether this Bill is bad as compared with the system which it replaces. Is this, or is it not, as compared with the system under which we live, a great reform? I do not ask whether it is a great reform as compared with some plan which the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen has in the recesses of his conscience. I do not ask whether it is a great plan as compared with a scheme half suggested by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, because those schemes have not been developed and cannot be compared. I ask one question only, and on the answer ought to depend the vote of every man who votes tonight. Is this scheme of the Government a great educational reform compared with the existing system which it is destined to replace? At the present moment our elementary education is carried on by isolated schools unconnected with each other, unconnected with the locality in which they exist; unorganised into any coherent whole to serve the interests of the population. That is, at any rate, changed. All schools are now put under a co-ordinating authority, and, so far, a great reform is established. Secondly, the great majority of these schools, or a large number of them—I do not wish to put it too high—are ill-equipped for want of funds. Is this Bill or is it not a great reform in that? Nobody can deny, and nobody does deny, that it is a great reform. In the third place, under our existing system a large number of these elementary schools are imperfectly staffed, and the staffs which have to work them are imperfectly and inadequately paid. Is that denied? It is not denied, nor can it be denied that that evil is remedied by the present Bill. In the fourth place, there is at the present time a competition, in many cases a ruinous competition, between two kinds of schools, under wholly different management, yet carrying out the same great objects, and educating the same classes. That competition is put an end to by this Bill. Can it be denied by any educational reformer that that also is an enormous educational improvement? In the fifth place, there is under our existing system a most imperfect machinery for educating the teachers of the rising generation. Many of them get no proper training at all. Those who do get a proper training are very commonly persons belonging to one denomination which has had the public spirit or the power to obtain training for them. Is that an admirable system? Is it a system which we ought to permit or which any other civilised country in the world would permit? But if you carry the rejection of the Third Reading, you will permit it, and permit it indefinitely. Is it not a great thing to have provided, at all events, the machinery by which this great defect can be remedied? In the sixth place, as has been admitted on every side of the House, there is no provision at all under our existing system for secondary education properly considered. There is provision no doubt for technical education, but for secondary education in its full sense our educational machinery at the present time is wholly and utterly inadequate. Is that not a great defect, and is that not remedied? It is, if the public authorities do their duty, absolutely remedied, and that, again, I claim as a reason why the House should accept the Third Reading of this Bill. These are great educational interests. But there is then the co-ordination of education, the combination of primary, secondary, and higher education in one general scheme; and there is, last of all, a matter on which I confess I think the present Government have received but very scant gratitude from those who in this House profess to represent the Nonconformists of this country—I mean what is known as the pupil teacher grievance and the general teacher grievance. I remember well enough, many years ago, when I was newer to these educational problems than I am now, the Member for Carnarvon drawing my attention in this House to the pupil teacher grievance. We have remedied that absolutely. [HON. MEMBERS: No, no.] The pupil teacher grievance is absolutely remedied. There is no child of a Nonconformist now who desires to enter the teaching profession who will be precluded, because he or she is a Nonconformist, from obtaining the requisite training of a pupil teacher. That grievance having been entirely swept away, we are now told that that is a matter which nobody need thank us for, because, after all, when you train these Nonconformist pupils they will not find a place anywhere. Yes, but that was not the Nonconformist teacher grievance, The Nonconformist teacher grievance was the one which I have described and the one which we have swept away. But even this secondary grievance which has now been discovered and added to the old pupil teacher grievance—even that has been largely mitigated, because the teacherships other than the head teacherships in denominational schools are now thrown open, if the management are prepared to use the powers given to them by the Bill, to Nonconformists. Of course I do not want in the least to exaggerate. I have no doubt whatever that the great majority of teachers in denominational schools will remain denominational—I do not in the least wish to pretend or suggest to the House that any other result will ensue—but it does make a difference, and there will be a large number of schools in which another policy will be pursued.

I do not say that I have completed the list of changes in our educational system, which are great and admitted changes for the better, produced by this Bill, but I think every candid man will find it impossible in his heart and conscience to deny that, in every one of the great examples I have mentioned, we have made a revolution, and a revolution for the better. If this revolution were not carried out, if the Amendment of the Leader of the Opposition were to find a majority in the Lobbies, what would be the result? Every one of these great reforms would be postponed, and, as I venture to think, indefinitely postponed. It is perfectly easy for hon. Gentlemen opposite, criticising our Bill, to say, "Oh, how much better it would be if you could do this, that, or the other thing." If they came into power tomorrow, if we had that General Election from which they hope so much, next week, and if the most sanguine estimate of the most sanguine of hon. Gentlemen opposite were carried into effect, is there a single serious politician on that side who thinks that the Government that would then be formed could come down to this House and go to the country with great scheme of educational reform with any hope of carrying it? Why, it is nonsense, and everybody knows it is nonsense. I remember reading a document, called the "British Weekly" Catechism, which was directed against this Bill, in which the hope, the avowed expectation, was that if this Bill could be defeated then the educational system of the country would go on until by the mere difficulty of getting subscriptions, by the slow starvation of the voluntary schools, we might gradually, year after year, see the board schools increase, the voluntary schools diminish, until there was what they were pleased to term a national system of education entirely founded on the board school system. And I believe that is absolutely the only policy that would be open to the hon. Gentlemen opposite, not because I believe them to be insincere in their desire for educational reform, but simply because the difficulties of this task, and Heaven knows every one who has tried to deal with it must be prepared to admit them, are so great that it would be absolutely out of their power to carry out any of the schemes which they so airily suggest in the irresponsibility of opposition.

Let the House and the country realise that we have this night to choose whether we accept a great educational reform, which in the opinion of some may have defects or demerits, which in the opinion of some may give too much to this sect or to that, and which may not deal with all the speculative questions which some would desire to see treated according to some theoretical plan of perfection; and that it is the only practical scheme that has been placed before the country for putting our educational system upon a national basis. I admit that it has many opponents, I admit that it is looked at with suspicion by large classes in the country, I admit that the militant Nonconformists have denounced it with extreme, and I would almost have said with unscrupulous, violence. [HON. MEMBERS "Oh."] I am not talking of anybody in this House, because I have already told the House on previous occasions what I think of the manner in which the opposition to this Bill has been here conducted, which I think does on the whole great credit to this House—I am talking of speeches and pamphlets in the country. It has been assailed, as I say, by extreme persons who think that some cherished ecclesiastical view is interfered with by the provisions of the Bill; and the ratepayers have looked at it with suspicion, because they have been afraid that additional burdens may be thrown upon them, as they will be thrown upon them by this Bill, but much less by this Bill than by any scheme which I have heard suggested by hon. Gentlemen opposite. I quite acknowledge that if all the great interests and all the great classes that I have enumerated are going to combine to defeat this educational Measure they may do much to impair its utility; but I hope and think better of my countrymen. I ask no man to change his opinion upon this Bill; I ask no man to give up what he regards as a conscientious conviction; my demand is simply this—living as we do in a free and constitutionally governed country—that they should attempt to make the best of a measure passed by the Legislature of this country, and that if that measure fails, and in so far as it fails, they should devote their attention to amending it. I do not ask them to approve it, I do not ask them to say that if they had been in power they would not have found some much better plan for dealing with the infinitely difficult problem; but I do ask them, I do make this demand on the patriotism and public spirit of every class, clerical and non clerical, in this country, that when this Bill becomes law they shall do their best to work it while it is unamended, and, if it requires amendment, that they shall use constitutional means to amend it in conformity with the declared will of the people. I have hopes that when it is brought into operation, when it is actually in working order, it will be found that no religious interest receives any unfair advantage [HON. MEMBERS: "No, no"]; that at all events is my hope, that no religious interest is unfairly benefited or unfairly depressed. I have hopes that, with due regard to every existing right and privilege, and with due regard to all the theories of local government, which are gradually developing in this country to the great advantage of public life, this Measure will be found not merely one which is consistent with our whole theory of local government, not merely one which will strengthen and dignify the great assemblies which we hand over to the management of our local affairs, but it will be, in addition, the greatest reform of all kinds of education which this country has, for thirty years, seen adopted; and that, if it requires change, as everything requires change in the progress of time, it will not be because we have been the slaves of an ecclesiastical clique or the advocates of any narrow scheme of national education, but because as time goes on, and as national needs change and advance, so alterations are required in every scheme, however well devised, however honestly intended, which this House and this Legislature may pass. In that hope, I earnestly trust that every friend of education in this House tonight will give his vote in favour of this Bill, reserving, of course, every freedom as regards the future; but, as regards the present, recognising that this scheme, and this scheme alone, holds the field, and that if this scheme is rejected we are bogged for years to come in the present utterly indefensible system of primary, secondary, and technical education, under which we have so long laboured and groaned.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 286 ; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 605.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli. Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt. Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt. Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H(City of Lond.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon.S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,WalfordD(Wednesbury
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Rt Hn.LordG(Mid'x
Hanbury,Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somerset,E
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, CaptainHerbertMerton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walth'mstow
Morrell. George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham

Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J, Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(11.59.) Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 246; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 606.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockie, John
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hon J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsf'ld

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the house without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 4th December, 1902.

THE EARL OF BELMORE

Took the Oath.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY

Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (WATER TUBE BOILERS).

Report of trials of H.M.S. "Sheldrake," H.M.S. "Seagull," H.M.S. "Espiègle," and H.M.S. "Fantôme" (with diagrams).

MERCANTILE CRUISERS.

Report of the Committee on Mercantile Cruisers.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 373. Jamaica (Report for 1901–1902).

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1901).

Area, houses, and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities of the counties of (I.) Wilts; (II.) Hertford; (III.) Cumberland.

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT).

Report of the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, for the year 1901.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1857.

Rules approved by His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland for the reception of pauper lunatics into lunatic wards of poorhouses.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) RULES (JERSEY).

Rules made under the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, as extended by the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation (Jersey) Act, 1900.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of scientific adviser in the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition in favour of; of School Board of Birmingham.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition for rejection of, pending reference to the country, of National Council of Evangelical Free Churches.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in the Committee of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees"—[The Lord President (*Duke of Devonshire*)]; agreed to.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a tomorrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

THE EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

[SECOND READING. FIRST DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, no one can regret more than I do that your Lordships should have to discuss so important a measure, on which a large number of your Lordships are eminently well qualified to express an

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

opinion, within a time which I am afraid will be so limited, unless, indeed, any prolongation of the session were contemplated, which would, I fear, cause serious inconvenience to many of your Lordships, and at the same time involve very serious and grave disturbance of the legislative work of next session. The time before the end of the session is now limited, but I do not think that the inconvenience your Lordships must feel can be imputed to the Government. This Bill has occupied in the other House a length of time almost equal to that ever devoted to any measure, and has occupied in Committee more time than any measure ever submitted to Parliament. The Education Act of 1870 occupied in all twenty-two days in the House of Commons. The Home Rule Bill of 1893 occupied seventy-eight days, of which forty-six days were devoted to the Committee stage; and the present Bill has occupied fifty-eight days, of which no fewer than forty-six were devoted to discussing the details of the Bill, besides two days on which the financial Resolutions were under discussion. If any blame can be attributed to the Government for the shortness of time allowed to your Lordships, it is only that they did not resort at an earlier period to those drastic measures which were eventually necessary. In the case of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 closure by compartments was resorted to after twenty-eight days in Committee, whereas in the present case that Resolution was not moved until the Bill had occupied thirty-nine days. The Government were extremely unwilling to resort to any measure of this kind on a Bill of this importance, and it will be admitted that they extended forbearance to the utmost limit.

The Minister who is in charge of a Bill coming from the other House labours under a disadvantage. There is no discussion of such a Bill in this House on the First Reading, and he is compelled in moving the Second Reading to combine such explanation as to the structure and provisions of the Bill as may be necessary with such arguments as he may think necessary in support of the principles of the Bill. I feel that it will be difficult for me, with due regard to the time and patience of your Lordships, to combine these two somewhat different duties on the present occasion. I shall assume, therefore, that during the protracted discussions on the Bill in another place and in the country most of your Lordships have made yourselves tolerably well acquainted with the main provisions of the Bill. It may be convenient, however, that I should very briefly review the previous legislative attempts of the Government and the position in which the comparative failure of those attempts, taken in conjunction with the important judicial decisions, placed the question, and also explain the reason why it has been deemed imperatively necessary by the Government to introduce a measure of so controversial a character, and one which has not only occupied a great part of the time of the other House, but has deprived your Lordships of almost any legislative work during the course of the present session.

The Bill which was introduced by the Government in 1896 provided that the County Council or the County Borough Council, acting through the Education Committees, should be the education authority for the county or the borough. That authority was to exercise all the powers already possessed by counties and boroughs under the Technical Instruction Acts, and those powers were to be considerably extended, inasmuch as they were to relate not merely to technical or manual instruction, so called, but also to secondary education generally. As to elementary education, the Bill provided that no new School Boards were to be formed, and that if a School Board were otherwise required, or if a School Board wished to be dissolved, or if a School Board were defaulted under the Act of 1870, the new authority was to take the place of the School Board. It contained provisions for transferring from the Education Department and from the Science and Art Department some of the powers exercised by those Departments to the new authority. It also provided a special aid grant for necessitous schools, and the organisation of associations of schools which was adopted in a subsequent Act, was then for the first time suggested. The Bill, as regards educational administration, was therefore based upon one of the main principles of the present Bill, inasmuch as it indicated municipal councils as the authorities for the future for secondary and elementary education, although the Bill of 1896 left the application of that principle to be adopted in a gradual, tentative, and permissive fashion. The history of that Bill is well known to your Lordships. Amongst other opposition, it met with vehement opposition from the non-county boroughs, and after it had been discussed for a short time in Committee, it was found necessary to drop it. The following year two measures were passed—the Voluntary Schools Act and a measure for increasing the grant which had been given in 1870 to certain School Board districts. Both were financial measures, the one intended to relieve the voluntary schools from the intolerable strain of poverty, and the other to relieve the oppressive burden of the rates in some of the poorer districts. Neither of these measures professed to do anything to improve the machinery of education generally. In the following year the Board of Education Bill was introduced into this House, and it was passed in a modified form in the year after by Parliament. That Bill united two educational Departments, which had been independent of each other, in one central authority. It also contained powers for transferring from the Charity Commissioners all the powers that were deemed necessary in relation to education to the new authority. The Bill of 1896 had not included any attempt to reorganise the central authority, and the Government felt that any attempt to deal with the problems raised by that Bill ought to be preceded by a thorough reorganisation of the two education departments. That reorganisation is still to a certain degree incomplete. It must necessarily be a work of time to combine two great Departments of the Government with separate staffs, separate habitations, and separate and distinct official positions. The complete amalgamation of these two Departments cannot be effected until it is possible to bring them under one roof, or until their permanent administration is controlled by men who have had some experience of both branches of the subject. The reorganisation, therefore, is still to a certain degree incomplete. But I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the importance of the principle which was contained in that Act. It is a strange thing that it could so long have been thought possible to carry on the work of education under two independent Departments.

There is, and there must always be, a certain distinction between elementary and secondary education. That distinction is recognised in our legislation. One form of education is made compulsory and free, while the other is not compulsory and is not necessarily gratuitous. Of the children in this country there has always been a very large number who would not go beyond the elementary stage of education, but it should undoubtedly be one object, at least, of a system of national education that the means should be provided by which the more intelligent pupils could obtain more advanced education The schools, moreover, should be so organised as to make the transition not difficult but easy. I have said it was a strange idea that schools attended by young children should be under one department, and the schools of elder children under a separate and distinct department. That unwise and unpractical separation has been, so far as legislation can do it, removed by the Board of Education Act as regards central administration. But that distinction still remains in regard to our local administration of education, and it is one of the objects of the present Bill to remove it. The Bill of 1900, which I introduced into this House, was entitled "a Bill to make better provision to enable Councils and other local authorities to aid forms of education not being elementary." The Bill was discussed in this House, was read a second time, but was never considered in the other House. Indeed, it was intended rather to indicate the proposals of the Government, and to give an opportunity for the discussion of them in the country, than to effect immediate legislation. That Bill, as a matter of fact, was largely discussed by County Councils and other educational authorities during the subsequent recess, and, so far as County Councils and Municipal Councils are concerned, it met with a very considerable amount of support. The Bill introduced in the following year in the House of Commons was based on very similar lines. It related solely to education other than elementary, it being intended later to add powers relating to elementary education. That Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons by a very large majority, but after a certain amount of discussion in Committee it was dropped. One Clause only, that relating to the situation produced by the Cockerton judgment, was enacted at a later period of the session.

In the meantime, while these legislative proceedings were going on, a judicial inquiry had taken place, and judicial decisions had been given which had consequences almost as important as any that have been brought about by legislation. Ever since 1870, in the absence of sufficient legislative provisions for secondary education, School Boards had gradually been establishing schools and giving courses of instruction for older children, and even for adults, which went far beyond anything which by any construction could be called elementary education. The Act of 1870 had strictly limited the powers of the School Boards to the provision of elementary schools, but the School Boards had not, I think, without the connivance, or perhaps even the encouragement, of the Education Department established higher grade schools, schools of science and of art, and pupil teachers' centres, where was given instruction which was, or professed to be, of a secondary character. As was inevitable, these schools were found to come into competition, not only with private institutions but with institutions which had been either founded or assisted by another set of public authorities whose powers were derived under the Technical Instruction Acts. Sooner or later this question was bound to come before the Courts, and when it did there could be but one answer—the answer contained in the Cockerton judgment. In this way, two or three years ago a large number of schools, some of which may have been superfluous, some of which may have been inefficient, and some of which may have been unsuitable to the wants of the locality, but still in which a large number of children and young men and women were receiving an instruction which they, or their parents, considered of value, were threatened with immediate or summary extinction. The position, therefore, at the commencement of the present year was this—the Government had attempted to deal with the whole question comprehensively, but in a tentative and gradual manner. They had then attempted to deal with it partially. They had succeeded in organising the central administration; they had failed to give a similar organisation to local administration. They had given a certain amount of relief to voluntary schools and to certain ratepayers in the poorer districts. They had succeeded in making some of the elementary schools more efficient, but not to an adequate extent, and they had altogether failed in making adequate provision for either the organisation or the supply of secondary education throughout the whole country. The effect of this comparative failure, and of the judicial decision to which I have referred, was not only that we failed to make that educational progress which we desired, but we stood, in the absence of some further effort, to incur the risk of actual educational retrogression.

Legislation, then, had become imperative. Both Parties in the State were committed to it. Eight years ago the last Government appointed a Commission designed to inquire into the best method of establishing a well-organised system of secondary education in England. We were ourselves committed by our previous attempts. The problem had become more urgent, and its settlement incapable of further delay. The only question was whether further legislation should be of a partial and incomplete character, based on the impossible and unscientific idea of a hard-and-fast line being drawn between secondary and elementary education, and of a distribution of local powers based upon that distinction, or whether the time had not now come, after a lapse of more than thirty years, for a complete and general review of the system which had been created by the Act of 1870 and the amending Acts, and by the series of Technical Instruction Acts. We had to consider whether the time had not come when an attempt should be made to place our national education on some intelligible and rational basis. We might again have attempted to deal with the question in some hand-to-mouth fashion, and find some escape from our immediate difficulties. We might, as some have urged us to do, have proposed a kind of permanent Cockerton Act, which would have legalised the proceedings which School Boards had, with the best intentions, but, as it proved, illegally, been carrying on. We might, at the same time, have further developed the powers of municipal authorities in respect of technical or secondary education. But if we had done that we should have established more firmly two authorities, each charged with important duties, possessing important powers, and disposing of large resources, to do the same work, probably to hamper each other in the discharge of that work. Partial legislation of this sort might have been a tempting course for a Government which had already to a certain extent burnt its fingers over the education question, and which was fully aware of the great difficulties attending any comprehensive attempt to deal with the whole subject.

My Lords, fortunately, as I think, there were two insuperable objections to any such course as that. The first was our educational conscience, which told us that any such course would be fundamentally unsound, and would, in the long run, tend rather to aggravate than to remove or diminish the existing evils; and the second was the conviction that we entertained of the fixed resolution of a very large number of our own supporters that no final settlement, or even temporary settlement, of the education question would be acceptable to them which did not do something to increase the efficiency and secure the permanent efficiency of that class of elementary schools in the existence of which they were deeply interested. In those circumstances we resolved on what is admitted to be a bold and comprehensive measure. Indeed, it has been described as a revolutionary measure. I will not admit the justice of that description. If we had had to deal only with one form of education possibly there might have been some foundation for such a charge, but dealing, as we had to deal, with the whole subject, and in the educational position which I have attempted to relate, I should prefer to describe the measure rather as the natural sequel and offspring of the great Act of 1870 and of the Technical Instruction Acts which have followed it. We had then to consider first what should be the education authority which we proposed to establish. For reasons which I have indicated, it was impossible for us to continue the dual organisations of School Boards and municipal councils. Our choice lay between universal School Boards or universal magnified School Boards, with a new *ad hoc* authority and the existing municipal institutions, charged with the duty of superintending local government and local finance. Either alternative which we could have adopted would have involved the disestablishment of one existing authority. If strong opposition has been offered to the disestablishment of School Boards it is not probable that we should have met with less opposition on attempting to deprive county or borough councils of the powers which they are exercising under the Technical Instruction Acts or on attempting to put an end to the work which is going on under their Technical Committees. It is quite true that some of these bodies have protested against the duties which this Bill will impose upon them, but I wonder what the West Riding County Council, for instance, would have said if we had proposed to deprive it of its powers under the Technical Instruction Acts, or to put a stop to the great work which its Technical Committee is carrying on at the present time.

I do not think that I need trouble your Lordships with any elaborate arguments on the subject of the creation of a new *ad hoc* authority, because I perceive that the authority which we propose, and its suitableness for the purpose, have only been seriously questioned by those who are opposed to our measure on other grounds. It is alleged that the Bill does not establish a single authority, or the unity of administration which has been claimed for it. It is said that we shall still have in certain areas separate authorities controlling elementary and secondary education, and exercising concurrent control. To a certain extent I admit that that is true. But if it is true, it is due rather to our existing local government arrangements than to any defect in the principle of this Bill. If it is a blot on the Bill, I contend that, at all events, the Bill is an inprovement on the existing state of things. I will trouble your Lordships with an instance taken from the county with which, naturally, I am best acquainted—the county of Derbyshire. We have in Derbyshire three non-county boroughs, which are the principal areas in which the Bill fails to establish a single education authority. Two of them have School Boards—Chesterfield and Ilkeston; the third, Glossop, is without a School Board. In one, therefore, we have the County Council and the Borough Council exercising concurrent powers over technical education, and we have no elementary education authority at all. In the other two, the same bodies exercise concurrent control over technical instruction, and we have a third authority, differently elected, controlling the elementary schools. In none of these is it possible for the borough to frame for itself any complete scheme for its elementary and secondary schools. In the first instance, because there is no body entitled to speak in the name of secondary schools or to control secondary schools; in the other case, it would be most difficult, if not impossible, to frame such a scheme, because the body which controls elementary education, being differently elected and having no financial responsibility, would probably have ideas very different from the County or Borough Councils as to the organisation of its higher grade and evening continuation schools. There would be the greatest probability of friction, of overlapping, and of bad administration, whereas, under the present Bill, there would be in each of these non-county boroughs a Municipal Council which would have full powers over all kinds of schools existing within their area, and full powers of organising a complete scheme of education for that area. I admit that in these boroughs there is still a possibility of friction on account of the concurrent powers of the County and Borough Councils over secondary education. But, although there is a possibility, there is a very small probability of such friction, because both these bodies being elected in a similar manner, and both having full financial responsibility to the ratepayers as well as educational responsibility, there will be every inducement to both of them by arrangement to make the greatest use possible of schools and to work together in one general scheme.

I next call attention to an important mendment which was introduced in he Bill in Committee in the House of Commons. The Bill as introduced provided for the appointment, by scheme, of committees through which the Councils should act. Clause 18 in the present Bill still provides for the appointment of such committees. It directs that all educational matters shall stand referred to such committees. It directs the Councils to receive and consider their Reports, but in urgent cases it relieves them from that obligation. But according to the terms of the Clause, although the Councils are bound to consult the committee, they have full powers to act as they please without reference to any other body appointed by scheme or otherwise. That Amendment may be considered open to some objection on educational grounds because the expert influence upon the authority is somewhat diminished by this Amendment. It has been inserted, however, to make absolutely clear the complete independence of the popular body, which will, as the Bill now stands, be subject to no interference by any other body appointed by scheme or otherwise, except in certain cases subject to the control of the Board of Education itself. This Amendment, I believe, is admitted by the opponents of the Bill to be a considerable practical improvement in making perfectly clear the reality of the control which will be exercised by the popularly appointed local authority over the secular instruction in all schools, voluntary as well as Board.

Another Amendment which I may refer to is one relating to Wales. In the Bill as introduced the county governing bodies under the Welsh Intermediate Act were to be the Educational Committees for the Welsh counties in place of those which were to be appointed by scheme in the English counties. But, as your Lordships are aware, the Welsh Members have been the most strenuous opponents of this Bill, and it was at their instance that this provision was omitted; and now in the Bill as amended the county governing bodies under the Welsh Intermediate Act are to be abolished, and the committees framed liked the committees for all English counties will be not only the education Committees for the purpose of this Bill, but also the governing bodies under the Welsh Intermediate Act. This Amendment, introduced at the instance of the opponents of the Bill, shows, in my opinion, that in their judgment the authority of the committees appointed by the Bill will be more effective, and will be better constituted for educational purposes than the former governing bodies, which up to now have, it is supposed, possessed the complete confidence of the Welsh people.

I come now, my Lords, to the powers which are to be conferred on the new local authorities with respect to secondary education. The Councils will have all the existing powers and the considerably extended powers which they now possess under the Technical Instruction Acts. Their powers will not be limited to technical and manual instruction, but they extend to the whole range of secondary education. The second clause of the Bill which deals with this part of the subject has been considerably strengthened in the Committee in the other House. In the previous Bills and in this Bill as introduced, those powers were permissive only. In the present Bill a more mandatory form has been adopted, and specific directions are given to county authorities to consider the educational needs of the area, and to take steps to provide education other than elementary, and they are to do this in consultation with the Board of Education, which, under the Board of Education Act, has a Department of secondary education. The rating powers of the County Councils have been enlarged to the extent of empowering them to impose a twopenny rate. With the assent of the Local Government Board that limit may be raised, while for the county boroughs there is no rating limit at all. As to the powers of the new authority over elementary education, here, again, the new authority will have all the powers of School Boards where they now exist, and the same powers in districts where no elementary education authority exists at all. They will also have large additional powers as to the provision of schools. No School Board can now provide new schools unless there is an actual deficiency of school accommodation. They can take no account of the denominational or undenominational character of the school; they can take no account of the character or wishes of the population; the line is a hard and fast one. Where there is a sufficient number of places in denominational schools the School Board has no power to provide a new school. The population may be mainly Nonconformist, but if there is a sufficiency of places in the denominational schools the School Board has no power, even if it thinks it necessary, to supply new schools. And conversely, if there is a sufficient number of school places in board schools, Churchmen or denominations are not permitted to provide a new school in which distinctive religious doctrine can be taught. That limitation is removed by the Bill, and under certain conditions the local authority will be able, in a case where it considers it necessary, to provide a school, which shall be under the Cowper-Temple Clause, although there may be no deficiency in accommodation. Similarly, Churchmen and denominations will have the liberty to provide their own schools, even though there may be a sufficient amount of accommodation in the existing schools.

Objections have been taken to these provisions on account of their alleged tendency to multiply the number of small schools. These objections, I think, ought in the main to be dealt with in Committee, but it cannot be doubted that the principle of the Clause is essentially just, and it gives a power to the local education authority which ought to be inherent—namely, that of providing not only a sufficient number of places, but the power to provide such places as the authorities may consider best adapted to the wants and necessities of the people. Besides being just, it goes a long way to remove a religious grievance. It is the grievance that the Nonconformist is obliged to send his child to a denominational school because there is no other accessible, and the grievance felt by the Churchman of being compelled to pay rates for board schools, and who cannot, if he wishes it, find a school in which the children can receive the religious instruction which he desires.

I now come to what is probably the most controverted provision of the Bill—that which deals with the maintenance of the schools. The local authority, under this Bill, unlike the School Board, will have cognisance of and will be responsible for the efficiency of not the board schools only but of every school within its area. If the authority is to be responsible for the efficiency of all the schools, it must have the means of securing that efficiency. That principle, I think, can hardly be questioned by anybody. How is that efficiency to be secured? There is no difficulty as regards the rate-provided schools. The difficulty arises in that type of school which has hitherto been called the voluntary schools—schools which have been built mainly by means of private funds, and which have hitherto been partially maintained from private sources. The difficulty we have to deal with is how the efficiency of this class of school should be secured. No increase in the amount of the grant from the Exchequer would accomplish it. The Bill does provide for a very considerable addition to the Exchequer grant. It provides an additional grant, which, I believe, has been estimated to amount to very nearly £1,500,000. That amount will be distributed to the different districts, in a large degree, in proportion to the necessity of the district. That is to say, a large part of it will be distributed on a basis ascertained by a comparison of the rateable value of the district and the number of children to be educated in it. I do not think I need discuss these provisions at much length, because it is obviously a portion of the Bill with which this House is not able to interfere. But the cost of education will still naturally vary in different localities, and it is the principle of the Bill—and I think the right principle—that in all cases there will be some margin of the cost which will remain to be locally provided. What then is to be done in those districts where the voluntary subscription will not suffice to meet the cost of this margin that will remain to be provided? Either we must give to the local authority power to acquire compulsorily those schools which, for want of funds, are inefficient, or we must give them power to close them and to replace them by others, or, as the Bill proposes to do, we must require the local authority to find the funds to make them efficient. Are we to say to the supporters of these schools, "Your schools have done their work. There was a time when they were the only schools which provided any education in the country, but they are now superannuated and they must go, or if they remain it must be under the condition of the surrender of the one object for which they were mainly instituted."

I know there are many conscientious and religious men to whom a denominational school, especially if it is supported out of public funds, whether those funds be derived from the taxes or the rates, is an abomination. But what we have to consider is whether that is the opinion of the majority of the country. Certainly it is not the opinion of His Majesty's Government, and we do not believe it is the opinion of the majority of the country. And we have, therefore, deliberately adopted the principle that, subject to conditions which we believe to be adequate to secure their efficiency and all necessary popular control of these schools, they shall remain a part of the educational provision of the country, and that they shall not, at the same time, be compelled to sacrifice their definite religious character. This is the question which has now been debated in Parliament and the country for the last eight months, but I am not sure that even now we know distinctly what is the opinion of the Opposition on this question, vital and fundamental as it is. I have referred in a speech in the country to some speeches made by responsible leaders of the Opposition, and as they were not made in Parliament, but in the country, I may refer to them here. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at the Alexandra Palace used these words—

> "Let me at once lay down this as my opinion, that it is sheer nonsense to talk of a denominational system. We must have a national system, and a denominational system can never be a national system. The two terms are contradictory. A denominational system can never be made a national system with all the restrictions and disguises which may be put into it by Act of Parliament."

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman made great play on this occasion on the antithesis of a national and denominational system. I do not believe there is any antithesis whatever except verbal antithesis. But what is it exactly that he means? Does he say that the system which we propose under this Bill is a denominational system because we do not exclude from it the school which gives distinctive religious instruction? Does that make the whole scheme a denominational system? We might just as well say that it was an undenominational system, because schools which give only undenominational instruction are not excluded from the receipt of public funds.

But the scope of these declarations was made rather more clear by Mr. Asquith, who followed him on the same occasion. Mr. Asquith said—

> "It would, in my opinion, do no harm to the children of England, and it would wound the consciences of a very insignificant number of parents, if we confined the religious teaching in all our public elementary schools to those simple acts and truths which are the common heritage of Christianity."

That is, I think, a tolerably clear declaration. In the opinion of Mr. Asquith, at all events, there is in the future to be a Cowper-Temple Clause for every public elementary school in the country. We know very well what the effect of this would be. We know that if we incorporated any such provision in our Bill as this it would have the effect of closing half the voluntary schools, if not all of them. It would involve the country in the expense of either compulsorily acquiring those schools or of building new schools to replace them, and we should be doing this at a cost which is differently estimated at a sum of from fifteen to twenty-five millions, and for the purpose of closing schools which are valued, and intensely valued, by a very large number of our fellow-countrymen, and which to a very much larger number still do not offer any offence whatever. I hope we shall hear, in the course of the discussions in this House, what is really the view which is taken on this question by the Opposition, and whether they are prepared to contend that what the country desires and that what they wish to enact is that for the future no denominational school should be admitted as part of our educational system.

I fully admit the perfect right of noble Lords opposite to criticise, and, if they think fit, to condemn as inadequate and insufficient, the provisions which we make for securing the efficiency and the public control of the schools which receive public assistance. I admit their right to criticise and condemn the securities which we concede to the managers of these schools for the retention of their religious character as unnecessary or excessive, but I think we have a right to know from what point of view these provisions are criticised, whether they are critics who accept, perhaps unwillingly but in good faith, the denominational schools as part of our educational system, or whether they are critics who are openly opposed to their retention in any form or shape. That is the main issue. All the rest of the discussion is, in my opinion, mere detail. I shall not now enter more fully into the provisions. Every man who takes an interest in the subject knows what are the conditions we require from the managers, and what are the concessions we are prepared to make to them. Starting from the principle that we desire to keep, and do not desire to get rid of, denominational schools, we have endeavoured to make the best conditions, the best compromise—if you will, the best bargain—we could suggest, and which, in our opinion, will be fair to the State and just to the managers of voluntary schools. Starting from that principle, starting from that point, we do not believe you can suggest any conditions more fair to the State on the one hand and to managers on the other. The concessions are not all on one side. There is no doubt the Church and denominations under this Bill will gain a great deal, that is to say, if they desire, as I believe they do desire, to remain in the forefront of educational work. They will, no doubt, be relieved from the task that falls to the lot of too many of having to make bricks without straw; they will be relieved from the humiliating task of having to beg alms for the means of performing what they believe to be a national as well as a sacred duty. But many of them feel that that relief is dearly bought by the conditions imposed. We have heard something of this in the other House, and no doubt we shall hear more here. Ministers, the clergy of the Established Church or of the Roman Catholic Church, will have to surrender under this Bill much of the freedom, much of the sole authority, much of the power they have hitherto enjoyed. They will have to surrender their control over secular instruction in the schools, to which many of them may attach importance from a moral point of view hardly second to that which attaches to their control over religious instruction. Even in the matter of religious instruction their power will be no longer absolute, but will be shared with popularly-elected joint managers. The boon which this Bill gives them will, to many of them, not be an unmixed benefit.

As to the Nonconformist bodies, I know they do not welcome this Bill and that many of them are bitterly opposed to it; but I ask whether they would have been less hostile to any measure proposed if it continued the existence of denominational schools. This Bill does not strengthen clerical control in the slightest degree; on the contrary, it diminishes it; this Bill does not weaken public control over any school; on the contrary, it strengthens it. It brings it to bear in schools where hitherto it has not existed at all. This Bill contains nothing that aggravates a Nonconformist grievance; the real grievance is that it does not extinguish Church schools. They hoped, many of them, either to have these destroyed by legislation or starved out of existence. My Lords, that is a grievance we cannot undertake to remedy, but there are many grievances, of which we have heard much in the past, which by this Bill will be either removed or greatly mitigated. The Bill opens a way by which, as I have already shown, an undenominational school may be established in any district where, in the opinion of the local authority, such a school is required. It enables the establishment by the local authority of training colleges, or institutions in connection with training colleges, where Nonconformists can be trained for the teaching profession, subject to no religious test. The Bill removes the bar which has hitherto stood in the way of access by Nonconformists to the position of teachers. I ask whether it is nothing to Nonconformists that they, for the first time, are given a voice, perhaps a controlling power, in the management of secular instruction in every school. Is it nothing to them to secure efficient secular teaching in what may be the only available school to which they can send their children, without being required to submit to religious instruction?

I submit to your Lordships that this Bill gives effect to three main principles. In the first place, it co-ordinates education under similar homogeneous authorities, if not a single authority. In the next place, it imposes on these authorities, and gives to these authorities, the duty and the means for securing efficiency in every school. Thirdly, it preserves the existence of those schools in which definite religious doctrine is taught. As to the first two of these principles which the Bill contains, I do not think there will be any serious difference of opinion among experts and educational authorities that the Bill marks a substantial if not a complete advance. As to the third, I admit there is room for difference of opinion, it is a question rather of opinion than one that can be met by abstract argument. If the Bill were defeated, I admit that, with a change in the political position, you may succeed in forcing on the country either a secular system of education which it detests, or a colourless religious education to which it is indifferent, but if you are going to wait for this you will be delaying for an indefinite time the accomplishment of the first two objects; you will be sending forth to the business of their lives, to the work of the country, thousands, and hundreds of thousands, of children who but for your action might have received a better and more practical training. I think your Lordships would be wise in securing these objects, which are within your grasp, and in refusing to postpone them to that distant day when, perhaps, we may all be agreed, or at least be content, to forego religious teaching. Thanking your Lordships for the patience with which you have listened to me, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

* EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise under somewhat difficult circumstances to follow the noble Duke the Lord President of the Council. The noble Duke has made a very clear, and I will venture to say, a very able speech, going over the whole question of education as it has been before us in recent years, and I may, in a few sentences, refer to what he said in his opening remarks in reference to the late period—I might say, the short period—in which we have to review this enormous subject. The noble Duke said no blame for this rested upon His Majesty's Government, but I cannot entirely agree with him. Everybody knew this Bill would arouse very strong feelings in another place, and that it would probably be debated

almost word by word; and yet His Majesty's Government, instead of making this the first business of the session, spent a long time in discussing Rules of Procedure. I quite admit that His Majesty's Government after that were not responsible for another delay which took place — the delay caused by His Majesty's Coronation, so happily consummated after great vicissitudes.

In the interesting historical reference to education which the noble Duke made there is only one point on which I would differ from him, in anticipation of what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack may say with regard to the Bill of 1897. The noble Duke said that was purely a financial Bill. We on this side of the House did not consider it a purely financial Bill. We considered that that Bill in a very material point affected the settlement of 1870. Now, my Lords, I shall try to answer the challenge of the noble Duke when he said he hoped that in this House we should have reasons given by the Opposition for the opposition which we intend to give to this Bill.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I do not think that is exactly what I said. I said I hoped we should hear exactly what was the position the noble Lords opposed to us.

*EARL SPENCER: I do not see a great deal of difference, between us as to what the noble Duke said, but I am ready to accept what the noble Duke says, and in the course of my speech I hope I shall be able to indicate the position which we take up with regard to this measure. I wish we had not to go into this question at this moment. I stand here to-night in an unusually difficult position. We have not had the usual interval of a week or a fortnight between the Third Reading and the passing of the Bill in the other place. Last night only was this Bill passed in the House of Commons. I am not blaming His Majesty's Government for proposing the Second Reading to-night, for we on this side of the House were a party to it, and we see the necessity of taking the Second Reading to-night. But we are put in a peculiarly difficult position as we have to make speeches on the Second Reading of the Bill immediately after the eloquent speeches which have been made in another place on the Third Reading. At the same time this is so great a subject, and one that affects so fundamentally the condition of this country and its population—for it affects the whole intelligence and instruction of the people, without which they will not be able to do their duty to the State or to compete with other nations—that it is of the utmost importance that we should give our opinion fully upon it.

This measure deals, as your Lordships know, with two subjects, with secondary education and with primary education. We all know that there have been various attempts of late years to deal with secondary education, and not only within the last few years. I am not overstepping the mark when I say I believe that for the last fifty years all great educational experts have declared the absolute necessity of dealing fully and ably and thoroughly with this great subject. We have experts like Matthew Arnold; we have another great expert in a prominent place in this House, who, when he was only Dr. Temple, was one of the greatest educational reformers that we had. We are proud to think that he will be here tonight to give his opinion on this Bill. All these men of great ability and great experience and knowledge on this subject have been calling out for prompt and thorough dealing with this question. Now this Bill does not do so. It is a Bill of twenty-six Clauses, and only four, or perhaps five, deal with secondary education; all the rest deal with primary education. I do not say it requires a long string of Clauses to deal widely and wisely with a particular subject, but in my opinion the Clauses that have been introduced here are most inadequate for dealing with this great subject. The noble Duke has referred to this, and he has told us of various points upon which there is some expansion of power for dealing with the subject. He says that Town Councils may now have an unlimited rate to deal with it. The County Councils may only do so with the permission of the Local Government Board; they are limited in their rate to 2d. in the £. The noble Duke spoke of greater mandatory power. I confess, in reading the Clause, I can hardly see there is much of a mandate with regard to supplying the deficiency in secondary education. There is no Clause such as we have had in various other Bills that have been brought before us making it imperative that all the money called whisky money should be bestowed on technical education.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Yes.

*EARL SPENCER: I fail to find it.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: They cannot spend it on anything else. If they do not spend it they must keep it in reserve.

*EARL SPENCER: I do not understand that. I hope the noble Duke is right.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Let me read the Clause—

> "And for that purpose shall apply all or so much as they deem necessary of the residue under Section 1 of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, and shall carry forward for the like purpose any balance thereof which may remain unexpended."

*EARL SPENCER: I stand corrected by the noble Duke. I am glad that that should be the case. Now, my Lords, it also deals with the question of boarding schools for secondary education and day schools. I hardly think the provisions that are made for religious teaching under the Conscience Clause where residence is concerned are satisfactory. They are more satisfactory with regard to day schools. Now this part of the Bill which relates to secondary education deals with all continuation schools and evening schools. But there is another subject which is of still greater importance. It also deals with training colleges. The question of training colleges is one of supreme importance to education in this country. So far as I understand, the Bill gives power to the county authorities to have a rate for the purpose of establishing these training colleges. May I for a moment dwell upon this question? I believe that at this moment there are altogether forty-four training colleges, with 4,084 students. Of these, thirty-one belong to the Church of England, three to the Roman Catholics, two to the Wesleyans, and eight to the British and Foreign Schools Society and undenominational bodies. The Church of England have 2,780 students, the Roman Catholics 271, the Wesleyans 231, and the British and Foreign Society 802. This number is perfectly inadequate for the requirements of education at the present moment. We read in the reports of the inspectors that these training colleges are by no means sufficient; that they are not always efficient in their teaching, and in equipment they are deficient. I should like to read the report of Mr. Rankine, who is, I think, the principal inspector of His Majesty's schools, in regard to this matter. He says—

> "The number of our training colleges is insufficient. Many teachers would gladly avail themselves of the advantage of college life, but there is no room. Nonconformists especially are at a disadvantage . . . . Another undenominational college for women seems urgently needed. A trained teacher to every 100 children in average attendance does not seem extravagant, but to meet such a demand 46,000 teachers will be required, or 10,000 more than we possess. At the present rate of increase it would be twenty-five years before this modest requirement could be satisfied, even assuming that the average attendance of 4,600,000 children remains, which, it is to be hoped, will do no such thing."

That is a very unfortunate history of the present condition of the training colleges, and I doubt extremely whether the provisions for secondary education in this Bill will be able to meet this great demand. No doubt I shall be told, and told properly, that there will be a great deal done by grants from the Exchequer. But the Bill rather indicates that these training colleges are to be supported by the county rates. Although I am not myself so anxious to increase Parliamentary grants, I cannot help thinking that the Exchequer should find the greater part of the funds for training colleges, and I will give you a reason. Will there be any county willing to go to a very heavy expenditure out of the rates with the chance of the teachers going out of their area? Unless this is done chiefly by the Government—I should like to see them provide a large number of these training colleges—very little will be done to remedy this great deficiency of teachers.

Now I turn to what is really, in our opinion, and perhaps in that of your Lordships, the principal part of the Bill —namely, primary education. I at once say that one of the reasons why I oppose strongly this Bill, and am quite ready to see it thrown out, an event which is not very likely, is that I feel the greatest possible objection to many of the provisions in it, and I fear that many of those provisions, instead of improving education, will have the effect of driving back the education of the country. First, as to the question of the School Boards in the country. I greatly deplore that this part of the Act of 1870, which has done an enormous amount of good work for the public, is to be done away with. These School Boards have raised the standard of education to an enormous degree, not only in the schools under the Boards, but, by the competition which they have developed in other schools, they have caused great improvement in the education given in the schools in all parts of the country. But what does this Bill do? I will take the first part, which refers to towns. The Bill places the power in the hands of the Municipal Council, which is to be the local education authority. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Municipal Councils. They do their work efficiently, admirably. They have a very large amount of important work to do, and their operations are carried out all over the country for the benefit of the citizens. But they have more than enough to do, and I think they ought not to have the work which belongs to the School Boards thrust upon them. I believe that will place them in great difficulties indeed. There is another reason—I value extremely the manner in which these board schools are managed. They are managed by persons who are specially elected on account of their interest in and knowledge of education and everything connected with this great subject. All this is to be handed over to the Councils, which are necessarily not so competent to deal with it. Education will lose, it must lose, a great deal by not having these experienced men, who are special experts, at the head of affairs, managing education. If we are to get the best education we must see that a high standard is maintained at headquarters, and a living interest kept vigorous in the locality. Those who have hitherto occupied this position have realised these expectations. They took a living interest in the progress of education in the locality. The change in the management proposed under this Bill will not enable these schools to be conducted as they have hitherto been carried on, there will not be that support given in the future in the management of education as has been given in the past, and the locality will lose very considerably in the interest which will be displayed in education, not having the primary right to elect those who are to manage education.

Now what is the County Council, outside boroughs, to do? Its members will have to delegate their duties to committees. Well, in towns that may not be very difficult, though I object to the co-option for members. I prefer direct election for those who are to manage the education interests of a locality. Control will be comparatively easy in the towns, where people can get about by means of trams and carriages in a few minutes, but it will be difficult when you come to the County Councils which will have to deal with large areas. I speak with some knowledge, for I have had a great deal to do with county work. I have been chairman of the Sessions and also a member and chairman of a County Council, and, therefore, I say that there will be an enormous difficulty in getting the work carried out in rural districts. We have very large districts in our county, which is seventy miles in length and where some of the villages, over 300 in number, lie at a great distance. It will be perfectly impossible for a County Council as the education authority to control the whole education of the county. What will the County Councils do? They are to appoint committees. In a Town Council the committee, or the majority of it, must consist of members of that body, but in the rural districts the County Council may abrogate that and have a committee consisting of persons who are not members of the Council. I object to that very much. You may have advisory committees in the various localities, and that will be still worse. These arrangements form, in my opinion, one of the great blots on the Bill, which directs that education is to be worked out of the rates and out of grants from the Exchequer. How would this work out. Practically, the popular representation is almost a sham. My belief is that these committees, instead of being representatives of the ratepayers and those most deeply interested, would be persons who had nothing to do with representation. It is not for the first time that I have said this. I have always said with regard to popular elementary education you will never get any satisfactory management unless you have some body smaller than the County Council and larger than the Parish Council to control it. It would be a very easy thing to have the election of the district educational committee carried on at the same time and with the same aids as the election for the District Council.

I come now to another matter which has been referred to by the noble Duke, the Boards of Management—I mean those authorities who are to manage the old voluntary schools, or the denominational schools, whichever you like to call them. There is the crux, I think, of the whole thing. Those persons who will manage the schools in the parish are those who are in constant touch with and nearest to the parents of the children. These are the most important persons in the management of the schools. How are they to be selected? I object to the plan proposed in the Bill. These persons will have the most serious part in managing the schools, and they will practically have the chief business of distributing enormous grants from the public Exchequer, as well as disposing of the money provided by the rates. It is of the utmost importance that real local control and management should be allowed where these enormous grants are to be given, but you place this power in hands where it should not be placed. I say that the principle here adopted is entirely wrong. Then the power given as to the appointment of the teachers is one to which I have the greatest objection. I object altogether to an official of the State—because these schools will be practically State schools—being placed under a religious disability. These school managers will never elect a Nonconformist to be a head teacher. They will always elect a Churchman to be the head teacher in these schools. What does this religious test do? It not only limits competition and prevents the school getting the best man, but it reimposes a religious test which has been abolished elsewhere. This scheme, I am convinced, is viewed as most objectionable by the country and is resented among all the members of the Free Churches.

I presented a petition to-day from nearly all the Free Churches in the country against the Bill, and in that petition it is stated that 8,000,000 adherents of these Free Churches support the petition. Why is it that there is this great feeling against the Bill? The principal objection, I venture to say, is to voluntary school managers and the religious test placed upon teachers. It may be said that the educational authority has some voice in the matter; but it cannot interfere except on educational grounds. A teacher may be appointed who has high ritualistic views, and bring with him an atmosphere of religion which is hateful to the parents of the children in the parish many of whom may be members of the Anglican Church. There would be no redress. The education authority have no power whatever in the matter. There is one thing which has come out strongly in these discussions which I desire to bring before your Lordships. It is the absolute necessity of putting all primary schools in the country on an equal financial basis. We have now a law that all children must attend school. In some parts of the country, particularly in rural districts, the children are obliged to attend voluntary schools, which do not, like the board schools, give the best teaching under the best masters. Is it not very hard that the children should be compelled to go to these inferior schools—often the only schools in the parish—when their neighbours with whom they may have to compete in this world can go to good schools? I therefore believe it was absolutely necessary that a great change should be made, but I deny that if that change is to be made it should be made in a way which the Bill proposes. The noble Duke has challenged this Bench to express their opinion on the subject of religion instruction. I admit that the logical position would be that the State should pay for all secular education and that sects and private individuals should pay for religious instruction. I am afraid that, at the present moment, cannot be carried out. I myself am in favour of religious instruction, if not dogmatic instruction, being given in the schools of this country. I believe that is in consonance with the wishes of parents and of the great multitude of the people of this country. I venture to think that School Boards have discharged this task in a highly efficient way, and we have the testimony on this point of the most reverend prelate who preceded the present Archbishop of Canterbury. The late Archbishop said, in 1893—

> "We should get on a great deal faster with what we want to get on with if people would cease their futile denunciations of board schools. The Bishop of Durham has been carefully through the Board schools of the Diocese of Durham, and he tells me that he is satisfied."

And again in the following year the Primate said—

> "I am persuaded that in a very great number of board schools there is very good religious teaching indeed. Those terrors of a polymorphous religion, in which a child is being taught in one standard by a Baptist, and in the next by a Congregationalist, and in the next by a Roman Catholic, and in the next by an Agnostic, do not exist. I do say that in the Board school teaching in London we have a very great amount of the knowledge of the Gospel, and a very great amount of that which is practically and really the teaching of the Church."

I am quite satisfied with this teaching myself. I believe that dogmatic teaching, if the parents desire it, should be given out of school hours at home and in the Sunday school. I will go even further and say that under proper regulations dogmatic teaching might now, out of school hours, be taught in some of these very schools, and it should be taught in the Sunday schools.

As regards the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, I wish to say that if that is debated here I shall most strongly support his Majesty's Government, who I hope and believe will maintain the Clause. One of the weaknesses of the Church at the present moment is that there is a tendency in certain quarters to force the cleric and the priest over the individual independence of a religious man. I believe the Church would be much stronger if it could get more of the lay element into discussions and management. A very able and clever thing has been said by the Prime Minister about there being a party that wishes to make the school the annexe of the Church. The school is certainly the annexe of the home, and I think it is carrying things much too far to urge that the influence of the priest must be paramount in everything.

The noble Duke said he was not going to discuss at length the finances of the Bill, but we are entitled to refer to them. There has been an enormous change with regard to the finances of our primary schools in the last thirty years. In 1870 the percentage of income contributed by the Government to voluntary schools was only 34·7; in 1901 it was 78·2. That alone shows what an enormous change has taken place. I cannot help referring to a very able statement by Dr. Temple in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1888—

> "The duty of providing and maintaining a good system of elementary education is essentially a local duty. The Central Government may aid in the discharge of this duty, but cannot undertake it alone. There is no security for efficiency without interested local supervision; there is no security for economy without the vigilance of those who bear a substantial share of the burden of the cost. We cannot recommend that, in any case, the grant for the Department shall exceed the amount provided on the spot. Nor is it, in our judgment, a sufficient plea for overriding this principle that people on the spot are unwilling to contribute enough. Their unwillingness is not good ground for calling on the nation at large to do the duty which ought to be done by themselves."

I agree with this very clear Statement. Grants from the Exchequer over which the Exchequer has very little control, are often very extravagant and detrimental to the public interest. Local authorities have no interest in checking and controlling the expenditure, which consequently becomes enormous. As to the grant to voluntary schools in the past, I find that they may be calculated at about £3,346,145 annually This in future will be paid to the education authority. But the education authority will lose a certain amount, in respect of subscriptions, endowments, fees, and they will have to pay about £125,000 a year for the hire of schoolmasters' houses. That will come to something over a million a year. But what of new grants, some of which were made quite recently and long after the Bill was launched in the House of Commons, amounting to something like £1,300,000? That leaves, therefore, a balance in the hands of the local authorities. But I venture to say that it will be necessary to level up the voluntary schools, and if they are levelled up to the efficiency of Board schools there will be a very large increase in the rate. I calculate that that rate will come to £1,500,000. That shows what an enormous sum is to be guarded and looked after. It is said that the Church has been very hardly treated. I cannot see that at all. I think the Church has a very good bargain. The Church gets relief from the rates and it gets a larger grant. The only condition is that it has to allow a certain number of persons to take part in the management. What will the Church have to do? It will receive a very considerable sum from various sources, as far as I can make out, something like £300,000. What will be the cost of repairs? So far as I understand, it will not amount to more than £150,000. Financially, therefore, the Church has a remarkably good bargain. Then they ask, "Are you going to take away altogether our denominational schools?" But I maintain that the children of the Church will be able to get their denominational education as well, after this change is made, as before, and that they would do so even if the management and control were more popular than they are under the Bill. The Church will get the schools at times when they are not being used for secular education, and it will get them also for Sunday schools. I consider that that is of the very greatest importance. We shall find, if we look at what the Nonconformists have done, that they have had quite as many or more children in their Sunday schools as the Church of England. I find that there are 2,222,890 children attending Church of England Sunday schools, and that there are 2,977,886 children attending Nonconformist Sunday schools. After this, while the Nonconformists will still have to find these Sunday schools themselves, the Church will have their Sunday schools provided for them.

I wish to appeal to the right rev. Bench and to all Churchmen on this Bill. I wish them to consider what I believe to be the grave position in which they are placed in this matter. I will venture to say that they are opposing a gigantic weight of opinion in this country. I presented to your Lordships at the opening of the sitting a very influential memorial from the leaders of the Free Churches, praying your Lordships to throw out the Bill to which they are so strongly opposed. They state that they have 8,000,000 adherents, making this is no transient opinion. It is a well-rooted, conscientious conviction. It will not pass away. If an appeal were made at this moment to the country, I cannot but feel confident as to the result. Will they, therefore, and will this House, pause for a moment, and hesitate before passing this measure? The time may come when others will sit on those benches. Is it likely that any of those who are in opposition now will be able to avoid dealing with this subject? My Lords, believing as I do in the injustice of the measure, and in the stimulus it will give, as I feel sure, to religious animosity and bitterness, I move that this Bill be read a second time this day two months.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now,' and add at the end of the motion, 'this day two months.'"—(*Earl Spencer*).

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I have listened with the closest attention to what has fallen from the noble Earl, and I do not question at all the ability with which he has advocated his view of this Bill. I have complaints to make against the Bill myself, and some of them relate to points which he considers give no ground for complaint. The main purposes of this Bill do not appear to be questioned at all, in this House at any rate, and I think with very good reason. For the main purposes of the Bill are, in the first place, the establishment of a uniform system, which shall handle all the different branches of education on one thoroughly consistent plan; in the second place, the introduction of what has been a deficiency in our system for a longer time than I like to think of—that is, the organization of secondary education; and, in the third place, to redress an injustice of which the Church has complained for some time—namely, that the burden put upon her supporters is not fair. The subscribers to the Church schools everywhere find themselves in this position. They have to pay subscriptions for their own schools, which could not be maintained without subscriptions, and they have also to pay rates for Board schools. I think it is very difficult to maintain that that is just. The rates paid for the schools constitute a demand upon all alike, and whether a man approves of the school or not he has to pay. Nevertheless, he may be asked for a very considerable sum over and above the rates to support those schools which he thinks not only the right sort of schools, but absolutely indispensable.

The position of the voluntary schools stands upon this ground. The country will not have education without religious instruction. It has been tried under auspices that surely would have carried such a system if the country had been willing to accept it. The Colonial Secretary has told us how he tried it in a place where there was more hope of its succeeding than anywhere else in England. He tried it in Birmingham. He thought the just thing was to exclude religious instruction, about which there is so much difference of opinion, and to have secular schools only, but he found that his supporters would have nothing to do with such a method. He was not defeated by the Church, but largely by those who are and have been all along the opponents of the Church, and he was obliged to give up that theory simply by finding that the country would not support him and that his own adherents would not support him. For that reason, as he publicly stated, he finds no difficulty in retaining office in a Government which did not adopt his view upon that matter and does not now propose to adopt it.

The aim of the Bill I do not think any one will question for a moment to be a great and noble aim. It aims at making a consistent system of our education, and without such a consistent system our education must necessarily be bad. You cannot have a really good system of education unless all the different portions of it are so co-ordinated that the efficiency of the whole shall be derived from the efficiency of every part. Schools at the bottom of the scale ought to be in proper relation to the schools above them, and you can only get that to work thoroughly well if you put them both under one authority. The system set up by this Bill aims at doing that.

Further, this Bill aims at organising secondary education. Again and again in this House have I joined with others in pressing on the Government that our secondary education ought to receive attention and that we were doing damage by leaving it without organisation. The necessity of organisation has at last been proved by unmistakable proofs—namely, that the authorities charged with the lower education have been driven by the position in which they found themselves to encroach upon the secondary education which stood next above them. The noble Earl complains that although there is provision made for secondary education, it is quite inadequate. Well, on that point I am in considerable agreement with the noble Earl. I say unhesitatingly, that if I had the drawing up of the Bill I should go considerably further in the direction of dealing with secondary education than the Bill does. On the other side, you must remember that things must have a beginning, and you very often gain—I am not sure you do not gain considerably in this case—by feeling your way. There is nothing better, as a first step, than to appoint a body to deal with secondary education in such a manner as to put it in harmony with elementary education. The noble Earl has said that we should do much better if we moved a little faster. As I have been saying so for the last thirty years in this House, I think that I can hardly object to what the noble Earl has said.

The third purpose of the Bill appears to be the rectifying of an injustice which has hitherto been inflicted on the supporters of the voluntary schools by compelling them to perform the double labour of supporting their own schools, which were a necessity, and of supporting the kinds of schools which they did not themselves want. There has been an attempt made to redress this injustice, and I do not know that any better mode could have been adopted than that of putting the additional expenditure on the rates. Meanwhile, what has the country been doing? It has been quietly watching. Many of the clergy in a very impoverished condition have been spending their money freely, with severe self-sacrifices made by themselves and by their families, to provide what they found to be a necessary instrument in their hands for the discharge of their duty to the children of their flocks. The sacrifices which the clergy have made now for very many years, and are still making, seem to me to have received very inadequate consideration from either side interested in the Bill. They have spent freely of their substance for the discharge of a great Church duty, and they have now the satisfaction of knowing that this sacrifice has not been in vain, and that the instruction of the children of their own people is no longer to rest so largely upon the uncertainty of voluntary subscriptions, but is to be put on the stable ground of authorised national payment.

But the condition made is that, meanwhile, the supporters of the schools hitherto maintained by public subscriptions shall still be called upon for public subscriptions to maintain the buildings and to repair them. It is not a very fair mode of dealing with the matter. Voluntary subscriptions will still be wanted, and I am not sure, as the Bill stands, that they will not be wanted even more than hitherto, because many of these voluntary schools, in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining the subscriptions that they need, have become seriously dilapidated, and many of them have found themselves on the verge of bankruptcy. After all, this demand that they should be responsible not only for maintaining the buildings as they are, but also for carrying out any orders they may receive for improving them, does not seem a very adequate way of redressing the injustice of which our subscribers are perpetually making complaint. It is certainly hard, because they do not feel that they can keep up subscriptions at the same rate as they have hitherto done. We are grateful to the Government for bringing in a Bill which will make all this a little easier to them. But it is not very easy for some of your Lordships to realise what the school is to the clergyman of the parish. It is one of the means of dealing with the children who are as much his charge as the grown up-persons. He is the religious instructor of all the children of the Church, whether of one age or another, and he will sacrifice very much indeed in order to discharge his duty. Among those who have done their utmost to maintain these religious schools there are not a few who have done it, as far as it goes, at the cost of considerable deprivation to themselves and to their families. There are not a few who have been crippled in the necessary expenditure for the education of their own children. Not a few have felt that they were come upon evil times, and while this demand has been made upon them, there have been at the same time operating quite different causes which do not belong to our present subject at all. Their incomes have terribly diminished. I know parish after parish where the clergyman, with an income which is utterly insufficient to live upon and to educate his children, has been very seriously crippled in resources by the fact that he could not, in the presence of God, sacrifice the children of his flock, by neglecting to do all in his power to give them such instruction as the Church has charged him to give. The relief, of course, is great as far as it goes; but it does not go very far if we are still to be begging all round for money to keep the buildings in repair and to make such improvements as the thorough efficiency of education requires. I think that in this respect the Church is right in raising the complaint that the Bill is doing something, but is not doing nearly as much as it ought. The conscientious man, put down in a parish where there are so many claims, where his charges must of necessity be a drain on all the income that he gets, and without the means of doing his work as his conscience bids him do in God's sight, feels that the infliction is very often a cruel one; and I do not think that it has been sufficiently recognised. There are no doubt many of the laity who understand something of it, and they bestir themselves to enter into the feelings of the clergymen; but they can never know what the clergy know full well—how dreadful is the pressure to which the poorer clergy are subject in this matter. I do not deny that it is a great relief for the schools to be upon the rates, because instead of their being supported on an uncertain, fluctuating basis they are to be supported by the action of the law. It is a great relief, but I doubt whether many in either House of Parliament are aware how insufficient it seems to have that relief on the conditions now made. You cannot handle a Bill of this sort without looking to such questions as these. You cannot put aside all these considerations simply because it is not your business to provide for what is wanted. You cannot leave these considerations altogether out of sight. I believe that the Bill is a very great step in advance. I believe that it will greatly improve the secular education. I agree with much that has fallen from the noble Earl opposite on the inadequacy of the provision for secondary education of all forms and types. I am ready to admit—I fully believe that the aim of the Bill, though, in my judgment, not adequately pursued, is honestly pursued. The Bill is an honest and statesmanlike measure, and I hope your Lordships, in spite of any objections that may be made, will, nevertheless, pass it into law and let us see how it will act when it begins to work.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, I am sure every one of your Lordships must have been impressed by the speech which has just been delivered by the most rev. Prelate; but when he speaks of injustice to the Church I think he is touching upon somewhat debatable ground. He mentions, as a great instance of injustice, that members of the Church of England should have to subscribe to their voluntary schools, and at the same time pay rates for the support of Board schools. Anomalies of all sorts and kinds exist. I am bound to say, with regard to this subject, that it seems somewhat inequitable that the only owners of property who are compelled to contribute to the Church of England are the owners of the real property. It might be said, and said perhaps with some force, that it is rather hard that the country gentlemen of England, whose incomes now are also very much depleted by agricultural depression, should, besides having to pay a heavy tithe, also have to contribute to support their Church schools. The answer to the position that has been assumed by the most rev. Prelate is this—that the Church of England should have subscribed a fund of its own to maintain its schools and its independence. What we on this side of the House complain of is that instead of doing that, instead of the Church providing funds to maintain its own schools, it should ask the public to subscribe while it reserves to itself the right to manage. I was glad that the most rev. Prelate made use of the words "authorised national payment." That is exactly the position of those who sit on this side of the House. We object to this Bill because it makes an authorised national payment which does not entail an authorised national control. I wish to assure your Lordships that I am myself no enemy to voluntary schools. I maintain two entirely at my own cost, and subscribe to others. Nor have I any reason to be jealous of clerical management, because in one of my schools my two clergymen are the two managers. But I do not think we can argue from any one particular case in regard to the application of a particular principle.

I should like to amplify what fell from my noble friend Earl Spencer when he said that Board schools had afforded good religious education, and to add, on unimpeachable Church testimony, that voluntary schools do not of necessity afford sound religious education. The Diocesan Inspector for Ely, in his report for 1901, felt it his duty to speak severely of the growing tendency in Church schools to suppress religious teaching altogether for weeks, and even months, before the visit of His Majesty's Inspector; and that this should be done with the sanction of the clergyman was indeed, he said, a melancholy reflection. Canon Routledge is responsible for the statement that—

> "Whilst the individual superintendence of clergymen was supposed to be the special boast of Church schools, it was no exaggeration to say that in nine cases out of ten he had to report that the managers had taken no personal interest whatever in the lessons. In preparing a class of pupil teachers at Canterbury in the Bible and Prayer Book he was surprised at the lamentable ignorance of some of them with regard to the simplest facts of Scripture."

The fact is, there always is a danger that when the Diocesan Inspector is introduced and the question of religion assumes too much a professional matter for examination the real spirit of religious teaching fails. Of course, I do not wish to say that there are not in a great many schools in England religious teaching personally conducted by the clergyman which is of the most valuable and essential kind; but I do think that it is carrying the matter a little too far to say that we can entirely trust the clergy or voluntary schools in this matter, and that we can dispense—for that is the view which is urged by many—with the interference or control of the laity. I cannot help myself feeling strongly that we are dealing now with a very different Church of England from what it was in 1850 or even in 1870. We are face to face with a wholly different state of facts from those which confronted the men who accepted the Act of 1870. I think it would be very difficult for anybody in this House or out of it to state clearly and distinctly what the authorised doctrines of the Church of England at the present day are. It is difficult, I think it is impossible, for any Church to claim that it is an absolute authority in this matter unless it speaks in one intelligible voice. It is perfectly clear that the Church of England speaks in very different, I might almost say very contradictory, voices. On the one hand, the lower clergy adopt with impunity the practices and the views of the Church of Rome. On the other hand, some of the dignitaries of the Church of England are permitted to promulgate opinions which, if language means anything, strike at the whole root of the divinity of our Lord and Master. I say that when such conflicting views as these are publicly expressed, and the Episcopal Bench are unable to prevent their expression, it is a claim which cannot be supported that the Church of England should be the sole and only exponent of religious instruction.

I listened to the speech of my noble friend the Lord President of the Council with much interest, and as I heard the concluding portion of his speech my mind wandered back to some of the educational debates that have taken place in the House of Commons, and I have to congratulate the Conservative Party upon the absolute success with which they have absorbed the noble Duke's Whig principles. When the noble Duke, as Lord Hartington, was in the House of Commons, a Bill was introduced which, compared with this Bill, was a very mild and moderate measure in respect to denominational education. But what did my noble friend say on that occasion? He said:—

> "What is the position of Nonconformists under the Bill as introduced? They were forced for the first time to send their children to schools of the character of which they didn't altogether approve. They were forced by the provisions of the Bill to contribute to the prosperity and the success of schools of a character they considered objectionable."

That is precisely their contention now.

The Earl of Portsmouth.

> "But which they hoped might in the course of time disappear, not by the action of any violent change, but by the gradual change of the public opinion of the country, and give place to a system which, in their opinion, was vastly superior."

That, I presume, meant the universal Board School system. The noble Duke went on to say:—

> "Who are these persons of whom I speak? Are they persons as to whose interests no respect ought to be entertained in this House? These are men whose feelings and prejudices cannot be safely neglected by either side of the House. I should have thought that, if not justice, at all events generosity, would have led those having at their command a powerful majority in both Houses of Parliament to consider carefully the feelings and views and prejudices of these men, and when they knew that a measure would be distasteful to them they would have imposed it with the greatest consideration and forbearance."

That is precisely the position of Nonconformist bodies at the present time. Those bodies, roughly speaking, represent about half the population of the country, and are they more likely now than they were then to accept a Bill of this kind, even when it passes into law? It is not a question whether this Bill will pass your Lordships' House. I think, in a matter of this kind, we ought to consider whether it will pass the people. I cannot conceive a more objectionable legislative proceeding than to pass a Bill in opposition to the principles and strong feelings of such a vast body of earnest and determined men.

My noble friend Lord Spencer dwelt upon the manner in which, under Clause 8 of this Bill, a new test will be established. If this Bill passes into law as it now stands, no head teacher in a voluntary school can belong to the Nonconformist body. Now, I doubt whether, as a matter of general expediency, it is wise or possible to re-impose religious tests. Let us look at this not as a matter of theory, but from the point of view of practical results. We all know that the population of Wales is a Nonconformist population. In a Return that was issued in 1899, I find that the majority of voluntary schools in Wales are in single school districts. The total number of voluntary schools in Wales is about equal to the number of Board schools—the voluntary schools number 694 as against 733 Board schools. This Bill, as it now stands, will prevent the teachers in any one of those voluntary schools sharing the religious opinions of the parents, and I am bound to say that not only is that a great piece of injustice as regards the teachers but also as regards the parents. We in our class of life have the power, and we exercise it with great care and discretion, to select who the teacher of our children is to be. Why are not the poorer classes to have this privilege? Is not the feeling of injustice more likely to be accentuated and deepened when it is felt that the religious atmosphere of the school is hostile to the religious opinions of the parents? I do not believe that that is a condition of things which can last, because I do not think it will be tolerated. I am surprised that the Church did not institute a subscription fund, to which I am sure all loyal Churchmen would have willingly subscribed, for the maintenance of its own schools, and also a fund—for in that matter I entirely endorse the views of the most rev. Prelate—to improve the incomes of the clergy; but if the Church has not the public spirit to come forward and do this, why cannot it throw in its lot openly and frankly with popular management?

There are, I am sorry to say, several cases in which the extreme views of the clergyman place him in antagonism to his parish, and under this Bill the position of such a man will be very much increased. These extreme men in single district parishes have up to now been under some little control, because they have had to depend on public subscriptions; but under this Bill that will not be so. In Committee we must see if it is not possible to provide against an abuse of power of that kind. There are many parishes in England in which the clergyman would gain power if he would allow himself to work with the laity, and I venture to say that the Church is making a great mistake if it supposes that its strength in the country is increased by assuming an ecclesiastical position detached from the sympathies of the laity. Everyone who has worked among the poor knows that the way in which you can influence them for good is to interest them in their children. That the parents should have an interest in the school and in the control of the school is to my mind a legitimate desire. But that is not the policy of this Bill. The policy of the Bill is distrust of popular control, and knowing the force of Nonconformists when they are united, I question very much whether, in the interests of the Church, it it is wise to enforce a measure which is disliked and distrusted, which will never be accepted by a large portion of the community, and which will certainly produce what I am sure all religious minded people will regret—an increase of sectarian bitterness. I shall therefore give my vote against the Second Reading of the Bill.

*VISCOUNT LLANDAFF: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down has presented the view that the Nonconformists have reasonable ground for complaint under the Bill. I confess, looking at the measure from a completely opposite point of view, that it strikes me Nonconformists gain the greatest advantage under the Bill. In future every school that is provided out of public funds is to be subject, both in secondary and primary education, to the Cowper-Temple Clause. Schools that are governed by the Cowper-Temple Clause are satisfactory to nobody but Nonconformists. Every other denomination in England regards that as being a mischievous form of religious instruction. Nonconformists, therefore, will have built for them, as well as maintained for them, schools conducted under the system they desire, while denominations will have to build and provide their own schools. So that for Nonconformists to say they have any reasonable ground for complaint seems to show a mistaken view—I will not put it higher than that—of the facts. I admit to the full the Nonconformist grievance which arises in certain single-school areas. It is a grievance that I think ought to be redressed as soon as practical means of doing so are discovered. Wales has been mentioned, where large districts are inhabited entirely by Baptists. I see no reason why the County Council of such a district should not have power to provide and maintain a Baptist school. There are many districts in the country in which a school is wanted for Church of England children, and I see no reason why, in justice, the County Council should not have an option, at least, of providing a school for denominationalists as well as for Cowper-Templeists, which is only another name for Nonconformists. It seems to me that Nonconformists have an immense advantage under this Bill, for no school will be built hereafter out of public money except a school which suits them and does not suit denominationalists.

I rise to give expression to the opinions of a minority of the subjects of His Majesty, to whom I have the honour to belong, and who, although they give their support to the Second Reading, do feel severely hurt by some of the enactments that the Bill contains. I refer, of course, in the first instance, to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. It is a settled principle of the Roman Catholic Church that the direction of religious instruction belongs, as part of his office and of his Episcopal jurisdiction, to the Bishop, and to no one else. This Bill gives the control of religious instruction in our schools to a body of lay managers. Not even an appeal is given to the bishops. That conflicts, therefore, with our conscientious convictions. Two of the six managers are to be appointed by the local authority, and the managers so appointed will not be Roman Catholics. That is pretty certain. In all probability in many of the towns they will be Dissenters. The noble Earl who moved the rejection of this Bill, and the noble Earl who spoke last, both appear to think that there should be no test for teachers; that you ought to allow teachers of any denomination to serve in all schools; that, in fact, in a Roman Catholic school you might have a Baptist or Unitarian as head teacher. I do not know whether noble Lords are serious in that view. To appoint men who are ignorant of the subject they have to teach and hostile to the doctrines they are supposed to inculcate is to do something that approaches to the grotesque. These sis managers, of whom two may be Dix senters, are to control the religious instruction given in Roman Catholic schools. That is an arrangement which will not work satisfactorily. Again, one of the chief duties of the managers will be to provide funds for the repair of the schools. Imagine the zeal with which these two foreign managers will go about collecting subscriptions to repair the schools in which doctrines are taught which they abhor. I may be told that these two foreign managers will not interfere in the religious instruction they know nothing about. If so, they are useless; and if they do interfere they are mischievous.

The most rev. Prelate referred to the struggles which the members of the Church of England have made in support of their schools. The body I represent have made struggles no less earnest and no less sincere. We are not so noisy as are the champions of Nonconformity, but we are not less earnest. Out of our small resources we have succeeded in providing 1,100 schools for our poor, in which their children can receive that sound religious teaching without which we consider all education to be worthless and even mischievous. And after all those efforts and sacrifices it does seem to me a little hard that we should be compelled either to deprive ourselves of the benefits to be given by this vast scheme of national education, or to submit to a Clause which offends our conscience and is needless as well as unjust. What is the secret of the enactment of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause? It is that certain clergymen of the Church of England kick over the traces, so to speak, and teach doctrines which are said not to be the doctrines of the Church of England. That is a grievance which I agree ought to have a remedy, but what is the proportion between the remedy proposed by this Amendment, and that which would have been sufficient to meet the case? I should have thought that it would have been sufficient to give an appeal to the Bishop against the erratic clergyman, or give the parents power of appeal to the Board of Education. That would have been a remedy that would have been co-extensive, so to speak, with the evil. There are, perhaps, a few score of these exceptional cases of clergymen whose conduct has been called in question, but there are thousands of schools of the Church of England and hundreds of Roman Catholic schools in which the clergyman gives instruction that is agreeable to the parents, acceptable to the children, and welcomed by all. Why, I ask, should you apply the Kenyon-Slaney Clause in all those cases?

One word upon the question of repairs. It seems to me that the point upon which the objection with regard to repairs arises is this. By the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, a certain aid grant was given to voluntary schools and has been applied, as it was intended to be applied, for the purpose of meeting a large number of repairs which are not structural repairs. Those repairs are at present paid for out of the aid grant, but this Bill transfers that grant bodily to the County Council, free from the obligation it has to bear now—namely, the obligation of meeting those minor repairs. You are therefore increasing the charge on the managers of these denominational schools for repairs, and throwing an additional burden upon them. There is to be in everyone of these districts an education committee. Upon that education committee the provided schools will have ample representation. There must be a majority of the committee appointed by the Council, and therefore they will have complete representation and control. For the non-provided schools—the denominational schools—there is no direct representation. The Church of England is sure to have numerous members on the County Councils and the education committee, but Roman Catholics are not likely ever to have representation on those Councils. When the functions of these committees are borne in mind that seems to me a thing of which we are entitled to complain. The education committee will, either as an advisory body or as delegates of the County Council acting as principals, have the widest powers relating to matters which are of the deepest interest to denominational schools. It will have to advise or decide on questions of extensions of school buildings, of repairs, of equal treatment to provided schools and non-provided schools, of salaries to teachers and of equipment generally, including the choice of teachers and of text books. If the religious body which I represent has no representation on the education committee the interest and welfare of the schools that belong to them may be seriously prejudiced, and I do therefore appeal to the Government, and also to your Lordships, to say that we ought to have at least a representative upon the education committee. I hope the Government will take care that there shall be on these committees someone to represent Roman Catholics in matters which go home to that religious and unpopular minority.

It must not be forgotten that the religious instruction in our schools is interfered with by the appointment of two outside managers, and surely, if you claim to interfere with the religious management of a school belonging to a certain denomination, it is unjust not to give that denomination one representative. I may be told that by the Clause it is possible for the County Council to put a representative of the Roman Catholic faith upon the education committee. That is true, but the likelihood of their doing so is so remote that I do not think we ought to be asked to trust to that. I claim this, not on the ground that these are religious bodies owning schools, but on the ground that they are educational bodies which have done considerable work in education already, and who can only continue that work if the treatment they receive at the hands of the education committee is fair and just. Considering the little knowledge that the local bodies in this country have of out-of-the-way religions such as I am pleading for, it is obvious that unless they have a representative on the education committee, their chance of fair treatment is a small one. At present, we have, by the cumulative vote, been able to secure one representative on the School Boards, and, as far as I know, the presence of those Roman Catholics has not caused any friction; on the contrary, they have assisted in bringing about cordial co-operation between all the various religious denominations in carrying on educational work. I belong to an unpopular minority, but that minority looks to the fair-mindedness of your Lordship's House for protection, and I have a confident hope that a just claim, advanced by those who, by deeds as well as by words, have shown their zeal in the cause of education, will be met by your Lordships with indulgence and with sympathy.

*LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I am happy to be able, in the first place, to correct a misapprehension. The noble Viscount who has just sat down said there never would be a time, as there never had been a time, when a Roman Catholic would have the slightest chance of being elected to a County Council. I would remind him that the noble Duke who sits behind him, the Duke of Norfolk, was for some time an elected member of the London County Council, and I hope and trust that other Councils throughout the country will be as liberal-minded in that direction as the London County Council, and that their example will be followed. The Government have in this Bill gone far beyond what public opinion would warrant, in favour of denominational schools, and yet the supporters of some of those schools are not satisfied. Nonconformists do not agree with the noble Viscount that they have any advantage under this Bill, and they strongly protest against it. They take vehement objection to teaching given in denominational schools not being accompanied with adequate control. The moral would seem to be that it is almost impossible to have a satisfactory system of denominational schools where religious and secular subjects are taught in the same buildings and by the same masters, and consequently you ought to separate them. The noble Viscount strongly objected to the Cowper-Temple Clause being put upon secondary schools for the first time. I do not agree with him, and I would remind him that in that respect the Government had an almost unanimous body of public opinion behind them. The Amendment adding the Cowper-Temple Clause to the Bill had only 29 dissentients, while 318 Members voted in support of it. Therefore I am afraid the noble Viscount will see that it is perfectly useless for him in that respect to try and kick against the pricks. On this side of the House we often accuse our opponents of wishing to curry favour with the public, and we sometimes say they introduce a Bill, not because they like it, but in order to conciliate public opinion. It is certain that in introducing this Bill the Government had not been actuated by any such motive. The Prime Minister himself has been obliged to acknowledge that the Bill is not popular and that it may damage the Conservative cause at the next General Election, and he referred to the educational fiasco of 1896 by way of showing how very thorny a thing it is to bring in a comprehensive Education Bill. I think that probably I have addressed more meetings on this Bill in London and the country than any other Member of your Lordships' House, and from what I have seen it appears to me certain that the passing of this Bill will not only lead to a Conservative defeat at the next election but to a great Conservative rout. I daresay noble Lords on the Front Bench opposite look at that prospect with complete equanimity. It is possible that many of them agree with Lord Rosebery that the ideal pleasure is to get office, but the real pleasure is to relinguish office. Perhaps the chief recommendation of the Bill to the Front Bench opposite is that it gives them a certain prospect of well-earned repose, which they ardently desire.

I will deal shortly with the Bill on its merits for it appears to me that in this House there is another question quite as important as, and, I should have thought, more important than, that of the merits or demerits of this Bill. Here the chief question of interest to your Lordships is one of the gravest constitutional importance, and it is : What are the functions of this House as a Chamber of revision? Is it not a fact that this Bill has been rendered possible only by an electoral trick? Does not the passing of the Bill constitute a grave infringement of the first principle of constitutional government, and, if so, is it not the duty of this House to remit it to the people so that they may say whether they approve of it or not? With regard to the merits of the Bill I do not propose to give the House my own opinion, but the opinion, so far as I could gauge it from attending and speaking at public meetings, of the audiences that I addressed. The public object to this Bill because they consider that it is not chiefly conceived in the interests of education but of party. As regards the voluntary schools, the public conceives that the Bill is in the interest of the clergy of the Established Church, who are the staunchest adherents of the Conservative Government; and, as to board schools, the public object to the taking away of the supervision of those schools from the School Boards, which are educational authorities, and the putting of it under County Councils, which are primarily political bodies. The public further believes that the object is to place the board schools under Tory domination, because throughout the whole length and breadth of England, with the one exception of the West Riding of Yorkshire, every one of the County Councils have a Conservative majority. The country, then, has a grave suspicion that in putting forward this Bill the Government have placed the interests of party before those of education. That suspicion has been a good deal confirmed by an unfortunate utterance on the part of Mr. Wyndham, the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Mr. Wyndham recently said that whether the Bill was a good Bill or a bad Bill it was the duty of every Conservative—I use the right hon. Gentleman's own words—to "go blind" for the Bill. Surely that is putting Party before education with a vengeance. The second objection is that there is no adequate control in return for the large amount of money granted to voluntary schools. The public think, and I believe rightly, that the managers will manage, and that it is the intention that they should manage, because the Government have thrown a considerable obstacle in the way of the education committees carrying out their duty of looking after these schools by rejecting the Amendment which would have enabled the members of those committees to have their travelling expenses paid. If, therefore, the education committees do their duty and visit the schools, they will do so at their own expense. The Bill will stir up sectarian strife and bitterness. A large number of Nonconformists are very keen in this matter of the voluntary schools being subsidised by the rates without any control, because they believe, whether rightly or wrongly, that it will have the effect of spreading popery and sacerdotalism. No one who has been in the habit of frequenting public meetings against this Bill can fail to have been struck with the protests that have always greeted any allusion to the possibility of these Bills subsidising an anti-Protestant crusade. There is no doubt that the alarm, whether reasonable or unreasonable, is perfectly genuine. No doubt there are other people who, like myself, do not think there is any such danger. On the contrary, I think it will have the opposite effect, because to subsidise a sectarian religion unjustly, as the public think, out of the rates, is the way to make that religion unpopular.

Those who agree with me are not alarmed at the prospect of Roman Catholicism being triumphant. We are angry because we say that it is an absolute travesty of constitutional government that the rates should be used in any case to bolster up a school the tenets of whose religious teaching are absolutely detestable to the majority of the ratepayers. The noble Duke has said that the object of Nonconformists is to extinguish sectarian schools. Nothing of the kind. Nonconformists do not in the least object to the clergy keeping up these schools themselves. Already out of the public exchequer four-fifths of the money for these schools is paid by the public, who naturally think that a rich denomination like the Church of England might very well itself find the remaining one-fifth. There is another thing on which Nonconformists feel extremely keen, namely, the establishment of religious tests for teachers. The noble Viscount has said that to do away with those tests would be a perfect absurdity. Why? He said that teachers who did not believe in denominational teaching ought not to be allowed to give instruction in it, but we contend that this teaching should come from other than those entrusted with secular education. Nonconformists say that they will be paying an enormous price for keeping up these tests in the shape of the grave incitement to hypocrisy which they involve and the lowering of the standard of secular education.

The last objection that I shall take brings me to the constitutional question, which I venture to think ought to be of special interest to your Lordships. This is, I think, undoubtedly, a War-Education Bill, for it would not have been possible had it not been for the war. I do not think it is denied that the size of the Government's majority is due to the war. It is not denied that at the last election Mr. Chamberlain went about saying that it was the duty of Radicals who never voted Conservative before, and who, he supposed, would never again vote Conservative, to vote for the Government on that occasion, because no domestic issue was involved, but only that of the war. An ordinary Tory majority could not possibly have passed this Bill. The revolt in Parliament was something astounding. The Conservative majority in the House of Commons, excluding the Irish Members, who voted in their favour when they voted at all, is over 200, but what were the majorities by which important Amendments were passed? Why, this very Amendment to do away with the imposition of tests on teachers was only defeated by a majority of twenty-six, and on Clause 7, the most important Clause of the Bill, there were various Amendments on vital subjects which were only defeated by majorities of from forty-one to fifty-eight. The revolt in Parliament is exceeded in intensity in the country. During the time this Bill was before Parliament bye-elections took place in which the Liberal poll was increased by 38 per cent. while the Tory poll was decreased by 8 per cent. That was before the result of the Orkney and Shetland election, which was, perhaps, the most striking of all. A miserable 740 were all the supporters that the Government could obtain in that constituency out of a record poll of 5,000. Then we have the revolt of that most distinguished educationalist, Sir Michael Foster, who has given up his seat for the University of London rather than support this Bill. The revolt does not stop here, for the municipal elections and public meetings tell the same tale. I say that this is a Bill of the first importance foisted on a hostile people by an electoral trick, and in the name of constitutional Government.

On the constitutional point I will quote a man whose opinion I think your Lordships will regard as of considerable value. Mr. Green, in discussing the "Impeachment of Lord Strafford," after saying that Strafford perhaps acted legally but certainly unconstitutionally, proceeded as follows:—

> "It is impossible indeed to provide for some of the greater dangers which can happen to national freedom by any formal statute. Even now a Minister might avail himself of the temper of a Parliament elected in some moment of popular panic, and, though the nation returned to its senses, might simply, by refusing to appeal to the country, govern in defiance of its will. Such a course would be technically legal, but such a Minister would be none the less a criminal."

I am not so truculent as Mr. Green. I do not wish to impeach the Prime Minister or the Government. All I suggest is that it is your Lordships' duty to strangle this conspiracy against the Constitution. Noble Lords laugh, but I would appeal to another authority —namely, the Duke of Devonshire. In 1893 the noble Duke went with very great care into the constitutional question of how far your Lordships were or were not entitled to deal with the Home Rule Bill on its merits. He said:—

> "If I could conceive the case of a majority of your Lordships being of an opinion favourable to this measure, if, as the Prime Minister thinks might be possible, a measure founded upon a similar principle had been introduced by a Conservative Government, I do not undertake to say what the conduct of this House might have been; but I, at all events, should be prepared to say the duty of this House would be the same. I maintain that on a question of such magnitude, so closely touching the fundamental institutions of our State, if there is any object in the existence of a Second Chamber at all it is, at all events, to prevent changes of that character being made without the absolute certainty that they are in accordance with the will of the majority of the people."

The noble Duke, in meeting our argument that we had a mandate to introduce the Home Rule Bill, said, in effect, Your mandate is no mandate at all, because at the General Election there were other points as well as Home Rule brought up on which the election might have turned. Now, at the last General Election there was only one issue, that of the war. I venture to say that a Bill which puts our whole educational system into the melting pot is as important to the general public as the question of Home Rule, for a good or bad system of education has a much greater effect on the welfare of the people. But even if the House is against me on that point, I will again quote the Duke of Devonshire. The noble Duke was extremely angry because the Home Rule Bill was closured in the House of Commons. He said:—

> "We are entitled to say that we should decline to pass a measure so presented, even if only of minor and secondary importance."

Therefore, even if the noble Duke considers this Bill as only of secondary importance he would have said that this House ought to decline to pass it. The noble Duke went on to say:—

> "The consequences of our acceptance of an undiscussed measure would fall, not upon those who have been guilty of the offence [obstruction] —if an offence has been committed—but upon British and Irish subjects whose interests are disposed of without discussion."

I do not go entirely as far as the noble Duke. I do not assert that on every occasion your Lordships should inquire curiously as to the amount of popular support of any Bills that pass through the Commons. Such a task would constitute an intolerable strain. I do not go so far as the noble Duke, who says you are bound, independently of their merits, to reject Bills of first importance unless you are certain that they have the people at their back. But I do suggest that, unless you abdicate your functions as a Chamber of Revision, if it is clearly proved that a measure of the first importance is detestable to many, and disliked by most, of the electors, it is not only the right but the duty of this House to remit that measure to the constituencies. In this case the evidence is overwhelming—the revolt in Parliament, the revolt at the bye-elections, the revolt at the municipal elections, the crowded public meetings and the resolutions passed even at Tory gatherings. Add to this the fact that the Opposition in 1900 were lulled into a sense of false security by the statement that no domestic issue was involved, that a majority obtained for one purpose was used for another, that a trick was played off upon the electorate, surely we are justified in asking the House to resent such shabby tactics and to defeat this conspiracy against the Constitution by remitting the Bill to the judgment of the people.

VISCOUNT CROSS: My Lords, I am rather short-sighted, and could not see for the moment who was speaking, and I was doubting whether it was my noble friend or Dr. Clifford who was addressing the House. I should not have intervened in the debate if it had not been for the weight which the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has attached to the petition which he presented earlier in the evening. I thought I should like to see that petition, and what do I find? I find that the petition is not signed by the 8,000,000 people referred to, but that it is the "humble petition of the President and Secretaries" of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, acting on behalf of the Council, so that it never passed that body at all. And what are the reasons why they object to the Bill? They draw your Lordships' attention to the fact—

> "That this Bill, which was conscientiously opposed by half the population of the country,"

which I do not believe—

> "—not only is injurious to education,"—

which also I do not believe—

> "—but also is unjust to Nonconformists,'—

I think that the justice to the Nonconformists has been amply vindicated by the noble Duke who introduced the Bill tonight—

> "And subversive of their rights as citizens."

What rights of theirs as citizens have been subversed? What have they lost? They have got everything they had before, and they have got a great deal more. I suppose these gentlemen refer to the Act of 1870. Great importance has been placed by the noble Earl upon the fact that the educational system is going to be handed over to the Municipal Councils. I wish the noble Earl would look at the original proposal of Mr. Forster himself, which was to give it to Municipal Councils, and it was only found that it could not be given to Municipal Councils because in the counties themselves there was no authority of the same kind to whom it could be given. Therefore Mr. Forster's original notion of giving it to the Municipal Councils, which is supposed to be "subversive of their rights as citizens," does not go for very much. I will hand back to the Clerk this marvellous petition which has been presented, and I do not think it deserves the weight attached to it by the noble Lord. As to the constitutional question which has been alluded to, I think I may brush that by, because that merely means that this particular Parliament can pass no measure without a special mandate.

LORD MONKSWELL: Unless it has the people at its back.

VISCOUNT CROSS: I was going to say, unless it had the country at its back, but I stoutly maintain that this Bill has the people at its back, and I have not the smallest doubt that when this Bill is set to work the supposed feeling in the country will subside, and that my noble friends will find that they are totally mistaken as to the way in which this Bill will be received by the country at large. My noble friend has spoken of religious tests. I ask him, are you or are you not going to have denominational schools? Do you wish to abolish them?

LORD MONKSWELL: No.

VISCOUNT CROSS: Then we may take it from the Opposition Bench that denominational schools are to be preserved.

What is the meaning of a denominational school? It means a school in which you teach religion according to the Creed of the Church to whom the school belongs. Then, do you mean to say, if you are to have denominational schools, and to teach particular dogmas of religion, that you are not to have a head master who coincides with those dogmas and who teaches religion according to the foundation of those schools?

LORD MONKSWELL: What I said was that religion and secular education ought to be separated, and that there ought to be separate teachers.

VISCOUNT CROSS: But I asked whether you are in favour of keeping denominational schools.

LORD MONKSWELL: Certainly.

VISCOUNT CROSS: Then I say if you have a denominational school you must leave the choice of the teacher who is to teach religion in that school to the denominational managers. I do not wish to detain the House any longer. My sole object was to point out the tremendous fallacies contained, as I thought, in that petition.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE: My Lords, there is some danger, I think, of the debate degenerating into a theological discussion, and I hope you will allow one speaking from this Bench to attempt, at any rate, to turn it into an educational channel. It has been maintained that there has been no mandate given to the Government to introduce this Bill, and the noble Lord who spoke opposite has given us very strong constitutional reasons why such a measure should not be introduced without an appeal to the country. But I should like to say that, without entering into the constitutional question, which I hardly feel capable of dealing with, it does seem to me that any Government worth the name was absolutely bound by a sense of duty to deal with the educational problem at the present time. One of the arguments which have been brought before the country very strongly of late has been the commercial prosperity of the United States, and perhaps I may say to a certain extent of Germany, in comparison with England, and it has been maintained that education in Germany and the United States compares very favourably with the education given in England. I do not feel competent to deal with the question of Germany at all, but I do venture to say that there are certain lessons to be learned from American education. Three visits to the United States, at intervals of nine years, have at any rate convinced me of this, and I hope I shall not weary your Lordships if I try to suggest some of the lessons which this country ought to learn.

Let me say that after considering this matter and having had opportunities for observation for some nineteen or twenty years, I have certainly come to the conclusion that in the United States there has been very much greater progress made than in England during the same time, and I confess that the state of education in England at the present moment is anything but satisfactory, and I cannot understand how any Government whatever could refuse to deal with the educational problem. First of all, let me say that if America teaches us one lesson more than another it is the value of having one authority to co-ordinate education and to deal with its various branches. I will illustrate that by the state of things in New York. New York has to deal with a very difficult problem, for there are very many foreigners landing at this port, many of them having to be taught English, and I take it that there is probably no town in America where there is really greater difficulty in dealing with education. When I went to New York I found, first of all, a very large Kindergarten School for children under six; then the children are drafted into primary schools from the age of six to nine; then into grammar schools from nine to fourteen; then they have the opportunity of going into high schools from fourteen to eighteen, and then there are still further opportunities of higher education besides. The population of Greater New York at the present moment is rather more than 3½ millions, and there are rather more than half a million children in the public schools of New York. About 9,000 of these children apparently at the present time are passing on from these grammar schools, which they leave at the age of about fourteen, each year to the high schools in the city. Of these 9,000 about one-third fall away during the first year, and the others pass on during the other three years, but irregularly, so that of the whole 9,000 who pass into the high schools I observe by the last report which is in my hands that 1,411 had "graduated" (to use the American expression) generally at the average age of seventeen. But I observe that something like 1,300, which is very nearly as many as those who have graduated at the high schools, have passed into what really almost corresponds to the University. The lads can go into the City of New York College and the young women can pass into the Normal School. Now, that is what is done with one authority dealing with education—and free education all through. I am told by New York lawyers, merchants and others, that the great commercial prosperity of that city (and the same thing is said elsewhere) is largely due to this system, and to the fact that one single authority deals with the children all through from the beginning almost to the end. Now, my Lords, I feel grateful to the Government for introducing a Bill which, at least, establishes an authority that can co-ordinate the various kinds of education. I know it is said that very little is done for secondary education, but it seems to me that the great thing is to establish an authority. When the authority is established and is at work, it is perfectly simple—and I am quite sure that any Government would attempt to do it—to engraft further legislation upon this Bill and enable more to be done. But, at any rate, I am grateful for the authority being set up, and I am perfectly certain that it is in the minds of those who are setting up this authority to go further and give further inducements to lads and young women to pass into the high schools and receive what is commonly called secondary education.

My Lords, I am afraid that the arguments of noble Lords opposite, particularly cf the noble Earl who led the opposition to the Bill, with reference to what we may call generally the *ad hoc* authority, do not receive very much support from the experience of America. Two interesting volumes have been lately published by the Board of Education with reference to America, and I venture to say that they deserve study by your Lordships. It will be observed that there is a very great variety of custom in reference to the appointment of the boards, whatever they are called, which regulate education in the United States. But the point I want to make is this; that some of those systems which are most successful in reference to education are not managed by authorities which are elected *ad hoc* at all. I venture to say that on the whole the experience of America does not tend to make one believe that it is really necessary to have an authority elected *ad hoc* for the purpose of obtaining really good and efficiently controlled education. There is a further point with reference to this authority which I should like to advert to, which is this. One great advantage of the Bill as we have it now is that there are large areas in comparison with the small areas which have hitherto prevailed. We have found it so far, until a recent Act was passed, to be an exceedingly difficult thing to establish School Associations of any kind whatever. Speaking as the chairman of one of these Associations, I feel grateful to the Government for having brought our schools together, for there is no question whatever that it is by association that one school is polished, as it were, by comparison with another, and whereas before there was considerable isolation, now, and still more in the large areas which will prevail under the Bill, there is every reason to believe that there will be a very great advance in education altogether.

But there is a further lesson which it seems to me we may learn from America, and that is this. There is no doubt whatever that in the United States there has been a considerable advance in education made by a very wholesome rivalry between the great cities. Anyone who takes up a report of the Board of Education of one of these great cities is interested to find the comparisons made with other great cities. I was looking just now at the last report of the City of St. Louis, on the junction of the Mississippi and Missouri, a city of about 600,000 people. The Superintendent of Education states that the amount spent upon education at St. Louis did not compare favourably with the amount spent in certain other great cities. I think the cost of education altogether in St. Louis was about 22 dollars per child, and he said that in New York the cost went up to as high as 40 dollars per child, and that other cities differed practically between those two limits. In answer to what has been said about the want of interest which is likely to be taken in education in consequence of the abolition of school boards, I cannot but believe that we may set against that this certainly growing wholesome rivalry that there is likely to be between the great cities and the great towns of England when there is thrown on the municipalities the duty and the necessity of caring for the education of the people. At present they have not had that responsibility thrown upon them. Do your Lordships think for one instant that Birmingham, for instance, is likely to be behind Liverpool, or Liverpool behind Manchester? Has not Liverpool lately shown its independence in reference to its desire for a University, and is it not certain that the great towns of this country will enter into a very wholesome rivalry with each other in their efforts to provide for their own city as good education, primary and secondary, as lies within their means? I venture to say that the effect of that rivalry will be seen not only in towns themselves but in the country districts around. What we want is a really good stimulating influence brought to bear on the country parishes, and I believe it will come mainly through the towns, and that a wholesome rivalry between the towns is the very thing that is needed to stimulate education in the country. It has been said that the Board of Education is rather giving up its functions under this Bill. It has been said that we have hitherto had the stimulus of the School Boards, and the stimulus from Whitehall. I cannot seriously believe that Whitehall will in any way be less stimulating just because it pays its grant in future through the local education authority. It is perfectly incredible that any Minister of Education in time to come will blandly hand over the money without taking care that the education of the country is sufficiently raised. For my own part I feel, I do not hesitate to say, personally grateful to one representing the Opposition, I mean Mr. Acland, for the way in which, while he was Vice-President of the Council, he unquestionably stimulated the education of the country. Speaking for myself, I can only say that, while there was a great deal of criticism with reference to his administration, my own experience of it was that he was conspicuously and absolutely fair, and I am grateful to him for trying, as he certainly did, to raise gradually the elementary education of the country. My belief is that under any system the Minister for Education may be trusted to do the same. Therefore, so far as this Bill is concerned, I cannot see that there is any force, or any sufficient force, in the arguments which have been adduced either with reference to the Board of Education having less influence than before or with reference to the abolition of School Boards.

There is another point on which I should like to say a word with reference to American experience, and it is this. I think there is some tendency in England to depend too much on the rates and taxes and the Government, and to forget that under this improved system (as I think it will be) there will still be very considerable need of private aid and private endowments. No one can visit America without being astonished at some of the very large benefactions that have been made for founding colleges and universities and the like. As education is now to be co-ordinated, I may safely say that grants and benefactions given towards universities will really be of assistance towards secondary and primary education as well. It does seem to me that there is a sort of tendency now-a-days to depend too much on the endowments of the past, and to forget that we are now dealing with a generation of people and with a population of which our forefathers had no knowledge whatever, and that it does become us (and I cannot but hope that some of our millionaires will realise that there is a call upon them) to give largely in time to come towards higher and secondary education, and so more materially to assist primary education in the country in which they live. This seems to me one of the lessons which we may learn from the consideration of the American education.

My Lords, I am afraid that the controversy with reference to the voluntary schools is almost worn threadbare, but there is one thing that

I should like to say in reference particularly to what has fallen from the noble Lord opposite. The noble Lord said that we were entirely to separate secular and religious instruction, and the noble Earl who began the opposition to the Bill today told us that we had abolished tests altogether in our universities, and he thought it evidently a very retrograde step for us now to impose, as he called it, religious disabilities with reference to teachers in our elementary schools. But, my Lords, I ask, have we abolished—I do not like to use such a word as "tests—" but have we abolished definite and distinctive teaching in our great public schools? Most of us in this House have been brought up at one of those great public schools. Is there one of your Lordships who thinks that the great schools at Eton, or Harrow, or Winchester would be improved by a headmaster being appointed simply in virtue of his being a Senior Wrangler without reference to those higher qualities which count for so much in the training and forming of character? Is there any reason why we should be so very anxious to introduce a system into our public elementary schools which at any rate the great majority of us do not desire to see introduced into the large public schools? I know it is said that these public schools are supported by endowments under definite trusts and by the sums paid by parents for their children's education, but I venture to think that, after all, the great thing to be considered is—What is the best thing for the children of our country? What is the best way to develop their brains and their character? And, if we find that the old English public school system has been of such value in the development of character without any diminution in the development of the brain, surely that is a very strong argument for our maintaining the same system in reference to our public elementary schools as well. And, my Lords, without attempting to enter into details which would be more properly dealt with in Committee, I may say this, that if our public elementary schools are to be maintained, if our voluntary schools are to be maintained as denominational schools, it stands to reason that the appointment of the headmaster or the headmistress must be to the satisfaction of the denomination concerned. The noble Lord opposite says that we must separate secular and religious teaching. I ask, would he separate them in Eton, or Harrow, or Winchester? It seems to me that the aim should be not to have teachers of religion, but to have religious teachers of common things. When you have a man who is a religious teacher of the common things of life, and teaches those things in the right and proper spirit, you have got the very best teacher you can desire. I do not deny that with a system even of secular instruction you may have teachers who would be the greatest boon to the country. Nearly thirty years ago when I was in India I visited a very remarkable Mission—now connected with the University of Cambridge—the foundation of which was entirely due to the fact that a Government teacher, the head of the Government College at Delhi a little time before the Mutiny, was such a conspicuous Christian that he attracted to him two Brahmins of the very highest caste, and that led to the founding of this Mission. But, while I know that any system, if there are Christian influences in the country, will produce the men we desire, yet I think it cannot be seriously contended that you have at present any security or guarantee for such training as we desire. This is the main issue that is before your Lordships in reference to this particular part of the Bill, and, while I have been anxious tonight to speak rather on educational than on theological grounds, I could not help making this allusion to what is, after all, a very crucial matter.

I will simply add this in conclusion. The real issue of this educational effort does not depend simply upon Parliament, or upon the shape which this Bill may ultimately assume. It depends upon the country, upon the way the Bill is worked, upon the goodwill and the good feeling of the people who have to work under it. I know full well the objections that have been taken, and the very unhappy antagonisms that have arisen—I venture to say, frequently through a misunderstanding of motives and of facts. I think that already there is a very considerable opening of the eyes of the people, and that already the opposition to the Bill is very much diminished, and I am certain that it only requires a little further careful understanding and explanation of the Bill to make the country determine at least to give it a trial. I cannot believe that there are county councillors or others who are absolutely determined not to try it at all. It seems to me that that is quite an unconstitutional principle. For my own part, if your Lordships determined, with the House of Commons, that there should be a system of secular education pure and simple, much as I should desire to repudiate it absolutely, I should yet feel it my duty to do my best to work it, and to, at least, give it a fair trial. And I am convinced that after this Bill becomes an Act, the good sense of our people will prevail, and that there will be a real effort to make the Bill the means of the further development and enlightenment of the British people.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, the eloquent words which we have just listened to from the right rev. Prelate presented in a temperate manner the view which the Episcopal Bench take of the Bill. I approach the Bill from a totally different standpoint. I approach it as a layman, and I have one advantage over the right rev. Prelate which he is not likely to envy me, namely, that I had the privilege in another place of taking part in those debates which initiated the measure of 1870. Now, the first thing that strikes me is that every one of the gloomy prognostications (and there were many) then formed as to the probable success of the great measure—the groundwork of our English education—has been absolutely and entirely falsified. They were not confined to one side. There is not a bitter taunt which has been levelled at the framers of this Bill, there is not a sinister prediction which has been made with regard to its effects upon Nonconformity in general, which was not equally levelled and equally brought against that able, fairminded, and upright public servant, Mr. Forster, to whose memory I am sure the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition will do justice. No single statement that was then made has been borne out by the results. But those who feared for Nonconformity were not alone in their denunciation of the Bill. It was prophesied on the other side that the passing of the Act of 1870 would ring the knell of the voluntary schools. What are the facts? The statistics are now before us. The number of those voluntary schools has increased within the last thirty years 75 per cent. The number of children attending them has increased in rather a larger ratio and the amount of the Government grant is about 75 per cent. more to the voluntary schools than it was in the year 1870. May we not admit that all that we have heard lately as to the misfortunes which will be brought upon the country should this Bill become an Act have equally little foundation in fact as those prognostications which we made in 1870, and which have been amply falsified by the result. Now, what are the main objections that are made to this Bill? They seem to me to take two forms; first we are assured that it will raise the religious difficulty in almost every parish in rural districts. Now I can speak with some experience upon this. I have been for some years a manager and a regular attendant of the managers' meetings of one of the largest London schools, and I can only say that we never had to face it there. Just before the passing of the Act of 1870, I had become, and I still am, a manager of a large mixed school in a purely rural district. I have never encountered the religious difficulty. The difficulty that we have found as managers has been to interest the parents sufficiently in the religious education of their children. I know that it is held by some of those who advocate secular education alone that the religious faith of the children ought to be inculcated at home. I venture to think that those who speak thus know very little indeed of the conditions under which the life of toilers, either in cities or in rural parishes, is carried on. I do not at all know how the artisan who has to give the whole day to his work can look after the religious instruction of his children, and as his wife has the children to feed and look after before they go to school, and the dinner to cook and the children to put to bed, I do not see how she is to find time to give those lessons in religious instruction which men of all parties and of all schools of thought admit it is desirable that the children should be taught in in their early years. The other day I asked the (clerical) manager of one of the largest schools in the neighbourhood of London whether he had ever come across the religious difficulty, and his reply was: "Yes, I have. Since this Bill has been before the House one parent has expressed to me his wish that his child should be withdrawn from the religious instruction—a wish which I need not say was immediately gratified." I believe the whole fear of the interference with the religious faith of the children has arisen from the isolated acts of a few unwise men who had certainly tried to inculcate a teaching which was not that either of Nonconformity or of the Church of England, but whom the Bishop of the Diocese in which he happened to be had either been unable or unwilling to restrain. I believe the religious difficulty to be a newspaper difficulty, perhaps a platform difficulty; and it has recently unfortunately been rendered a Parliamentary difficulty; but as a question of practical politics I do not believe it exists.

The second bogey which has been conjured up has been that of the clerical autocrat. I have admitted that in some isolated instances—with which no one sympathises less than I do--wrong things have been done, but I believe that in 999 out of 1,000 voluntary schools such a thing is impossible, and of one thing I am convinced, that if it is possible it is because the lay managers of the schools do not do their duty. It is utterly impossible if the managers do their duty, if they take advantage of their trust deed, and call the attention of the Bishop to the fact that doctrines are being inculcated or teaching is being resorted to which is not consistent with the faith of the Church of England as expressed in our Articles of Religion. I may say that I think great injustice has been done through discussions upon this Bill (I speak as a layman) to the clergy as a body. I am old enough to remember the time when in three-fourths of the country parishes in England there would have been no education worth a name at all if the clergyman had not devoted his time, and often a much larger amount of his means than he could properly spare, to education which was then in its infancy and to which grave opposition was raised. And I am quite certain, speaking from practical experience, that in nine cases out of ten the difficulty which this "clerical autocrat" experiences is, not that of carrying out his own wishes, but that of interesting any appreciable number of the laity in the work of education which belongs equally to them as it does to him.

Then, my Lords, the next objection I hear is that this Bill is not a perfect Bill. Of course it is not. I have had the honour of a seat in your Lordships' House for more than thirty-two years, and I never yet saw a Bill turned into an Act in which I should not have liked to make some alterations, and I believe the same idea will have occurred to every single Member of your Lordship's House. This is not a perfect Bill. It is not in some respects what I could wish to see it. One serious practical danger, and one which I fear we cannot deal with in your Lordships' House, is with regard to the upkeep of the schools. That is now charged upon the school funds, but it will be in the future, in the case of denominational schools, a burden that will fall on the subscribers, and I think that may constitute a very serious incubus. I know schools myself which were built many years ago and which were supposed to be models of their kind but which from age and from the progress of public opinion have certainly become out of date. They will probably have to be pulled down, and at present I do not exactly see where in some cases the funds will be forthcoming to rebuild them. I think also that many requirements will be made which will take existing managers by surprise, and that we shall need all the self-devotion of the clergy and laity alike if we are to maintain some of the denominational schools at the present level and prevent their being turned into provided schools.

But after all, my Lords, this Bill, whatever its imperfections may be, at present holds the field. There has been no alternative scheme presented to the House. There has been scarcely any alternative scheme even hinted at. I believe there is one Minister who has held Cabinet rank in another place, who has indicated that he has some measure up his sleeve which may set everything right; all I can say is that if he has it up his sleeve he has never proposed it. I have read most carefully the debates which have taken place both in and out of Parliament on this subject, and I defy anyone to say that any clear and comprehensive scheme which could possibly be worked has ever been placed as an alternative before the people of this country.

Even supposing that the Bill is not all that could be wished, what do we gain by it? We gain four things. First, it co-ordinates for the first time our educational system which sorely wanted something of the kind. Secondly it places for the first time in the hands of a public authority the power to see that the secular teaching in all schools is thoroughly up to date and efficient. Thirdly (and I confess I attach great importance to this) it for the first time makes it possible for women to sit upon these boards as managers of local schools and especially of the rural schools in which I think their assistance may be beyond all price. I am not at all satisfied that in the board schools at present the pressure which is being put upon the children (sometimes even with the electric light) is not seriously affecting the eyesight of the children. There have been researches made by medical men into the number of children educated in Board schools within the Bills of Mortality whose sight and hearing cannot be described as normal. I do not propose to trouble your Lordships with the figures, but they are accessible to all of us. They work out most unsatisfactorily as far as regards the general health of the population. We know perfectly well that in Germany the medical authorities have already had to deal very seriously indeed with the tendency to overwork and overpressure to which children of very tender years are exposed in that country. I confess that I can conceive nothing which is more likely to prevent any overstraining of the youthful nerves, or the youthful minds, than that capable and clever women should find a place upon many of these boards, and that they should be able to apply to the moral and physical training of the children that assistance which is often wanted under present conditions. Then, fourthly, the nation obtains a direct present by this Bill of a sum estimated at from £25,000,000 to £35,000,000, in the shape of the schools which have been built by voluntary subscriptions, and which it would otherwise have either to build or to lease. I think that all those are definite and substantial advantages.

I quite admit that, as the right rev. Prelate observed, it is possible that should all the different elements who are mixed up in the educational question combine to wreck the Bill they may do it very serious mischief when it becomes an Act. If the clergy of the Church of England, the Nonconformist ministers, the Roman Catholic episcopacy, those ratepayers who draw nice distinctions between the payment of rates and the payment of taxes, and finally the school teachers who may be dissatisfied with some of the incidences of their new position—if they all determine that the Bill shall not be a success, it is possible that they may have their way. But I confess that I have more confidence in my fellow-countrymen. I do not believe that they would act in so foolish, so wrong a manner as to do their best to render impossible the work of educating our little children—who, after all, are a factor of the situation, though the consideration of it has been so often neglected. The men and women of the future generation, the men and women upon whom, humanly speaking, the weal or woe of this country depends, surely ought not to be left during their tender years to the mercy of an indifferent education simply because a number of excellent and well-meaning individuals have made up their minds that for one reason or another they do not mean that the Act should be a success. All I can say is that if that be the mind of the country now, it is very different from what the mind of the country always has been hitherto. I do not believe it for one moment. I believe that should this Bill become an Act it will falsify the expectations and the predictions which have been made with regard to it, as the Act of 1870 has falsified them for the last thirty-five years. I believe that if we can all be content to look a little more upon the many things in which we have a common interest, upon the many things in which we are agreed, and less upon the comparatively few things in which we differ, there is no reason why this Bill should not be in every sense of the word, and as far as human ingenuity can make it, a crowning success. It is never safe to prophesy unless you know, but I cannot help thinking that those of your Lordships who live to see the operation of this Bill two years hence will be surprised, as I am surprised now, to hear the sort of prophecies which can be made with regard to it—prophecies wholly unfortified by all the facts of the case. I think that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to those who have taken an interest in the education of the past, and I will not credit for a moment that we of this generation shall be behind those who have gone before us in endeavouring to make the education of this country all it ought to be, all it might be, and to give Englishmen a fair chance in the race of life against those competitors by whom they are surrounded on every side, and in comparison with whom they are at present sorely handicapped by the system of education—even improved as it has been—which now prevails. I would appeal to noble Lords opposite to dismiss if they possibly can the Party aspect of the case, and to concur with those on this side of the House who are ardently anxious for the future of education, and not to stand in the way of a measure which I am persuaded will be for the lasting good of the country.

*LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, the first object of every Education Bill should be the improvement of education, and I am afraid that amidst the somewhat violent disputes which have enveloped this Bill this primary object has been a great deal overlooked. Does this Bill improve education, does it improve the education of the young, does it fit them better for the competition in life of which the noble Lord who has just sat down has spoken?

Now, the history of education in this country since 1870 proves this, at any rate. It proves that if you put education in the hands of the ratepayers and allow them the management of their own money they will build up for themselves an efficient system of education. Since 1870, the time from which we date the birth of board schools, School Boards have spread and grown and covered the land until they now educate some half of the boys and girls in the elementary schools of the country. And they have done that in spite of every obstacle that has been placed in their way by the advocates of denominational education. In the year 1876 the noble Duke who introduced this Bill expressed his belief in the principle of the School Boards as the abiding and true principle which he said would in the end prevail. Their teaching, their equipment, their buildings, all are the best. Their educational results have been superior, and they have entirely out-stripped the sectarian schools, who cannot keep up with them. That the religious teaching in them has not been inefficient has been testified to by the evidence given before the Royal Commission, by the evidence given by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and by a right rev. Prelate now on the Bench. And with regard to their religious education. I have heard no complaints, no rumours of complaints, on that score from any of the parents of the children who go to those schools. Well, my Lords, if the object of the Legislature was the improvement of education, one would have thought that any Government having education at heart would have encouraged and spread the growth of those schools which have beaten all other competitors. This Bill proceeds to abolish those very schools. Every effort is made, so to speak, to catch the infant lamb, and to pen him into one of the sectarian folds; what the real worth of his education is to be seems to be quite a secondary matter.

Now, this Bill proposes to deal with two classses of education. It proposes to deal with higher education and with elementary education. It is quite true that it places them both under one authority. It is also quite true that higher education in this country has grown up piecemeal, and has grown up a great deal in a haphazard manner. School Boards, for instance, have come to the rescue of higher education; they have provided higher grade schools; they have provided evening schools; they have provided schools and colleges, and classes. But so far as the work of the

School Boards in this direction is concerned, the Cockerton decision—I venture to characterise it as an inspired decision—has destroyed and crippled that work. And this Bill now destroys the authors of that work likewise. This Bill, moreover, repeals the Technical Instruction Acts, and it destroys, in the first place, every statutory power which has been operative in regard to higher education in the past. It produces an absolutely clean slate, and what does the Government propose to write upon it? We have had some light thrown upon what ought to be done. We have had the Report of the Royal Commission, and the noble Duke has described to us the introduction of the Bills of 1896, 1900, and 1901. All those are thrown aside and the work of higher education is placed in the hands of the County Councils so far as the counties are concerned in a mode which the noble Duke now says is not optional. All I can say is that it was optional when the Bill was introduced, but an Amendment was moved to make it mandatory, and that Amendment was opposed by the Government. The words which have been inserted are curious words, and I am not by any means sure that they contain the compulsory powers which the noble Duke has attributed to them. The words are, if I remember right, that they "may consider," and if they do consider, then they "shall take such steps as shall seem to them desirable." That is language falling far short in its compulsory and mandatory character of the language in any of the Bills introduced by the noble Duke or in the propositions recommended by the Royal Commission.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: The words in the second Clause are "shall consider."

*LORD COLERIDGE: "Shall consider the educational needs of their area and take such steps as seem to them desirable." To my mind that is not mandatory. The County Council may say "Yes, we will consider; we have considered, and having considered we do not think anything more than this very small step desirable;" and I should like to know, if that position is taken up by any County Council, whether there is any lawyer in this House who would say that any compulsory powers could be applied to it. I may be wrong in that. I would only like to ask the noble Duke, if I am wrong, why did the Government reject the Amendment proposing the word "shall" instead of the word "may" which was in the Bill as originally introduced? The word "may" was in the Bill when it was originally introduced; the word "shall" was proposed to be introduced to make it compulsory, but that Amendment got refused, a division was taken upon it, and the Amendment was lost.

Now I pass from that to the next head. A very limited power of expenditure is placed in the hands of the local authorities. We know what the provisions are as to the counties—that the County Councils should spend the whisky money and 2d. in the £, and that the Councils of boroughs and urban districts should spend an extra 1d. in the £. Now, in this matter the local authority might have had an impulse given to it in either of two ways, either by direct popular representation, or by having certain powers subject to the direction and control of the Board of Education. It might have had, and I should like to know why it has not—because it would be a most useful thing—the powers given under the Endowed Schools Act of 1869. It has none of these things. There is not a word in the Bill defining its duties, its powers, or its obligations. And see what a wide field it covers. "Education other than elementary." Why that would comprise the education of the upper and of the middle classes; it would comprise grammar schools; it would comprise girls high schools; it would comprise private academies, and I am not sure that it would not comprise our big public schools. Also, such a definition would apply to the higher education in the elementary schools, namely (I will enumerate them) evening continuation schools, higher grade schools, the teaching of specific subjects in day schools, science and art classes, municipal technical schools, pupil teachers' centres and training colleges for teachers. Now with regard to the whole of this, there is no provision to compel either that the schools shall be provided, or that there shall be a sufficient number of them, or that they shall be suitable in curriculum, or that there shall be an adequacy of staff and staff equipment, or that there shall be inspection, or that they shall be available to all. I say, having regard to that, it seems to me so far as higher education is concerned this Bill is a very great step backwards. A great opportunity was afforded to the Government, which opportunity it seems to me they have sadly neglected. Now let us contrast this. There is an Act called the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889. Let the noble Duke look at the provisions of that Act. Each county has a duty cast upon it—an imperative duty—to submit a scheme to the Charity Commissioners for intermediate and technical education, and they have a right to levy a rate unlimited in amount. If those powers are entrusted to the local authorities for higher education in Wales, what is the reason for not entrusting similar powers, with similar compulsion and with similar rating facilities, to other parts of the country?

My Lords, I have said what I have to say about this Act so far as it affects higher education. I should like to say a word so far as it affects elementary education. It seems to me that with regard to elementary education there are two ways of dealing with it, both of which admit of very sound reasons. First of all, you can entrust elementary education to the central body, urban or county, a body which at least is popularly elected. There is a great deal to be said against that. First of all, it would add very severely to their labours; they would probably have to act through committees of their own number, and it would undoubtedly lead to an alteration in the complexion of that body. You would have strenuous educational conflicts in each Division and you would have a different style of man coming upon the central authority; and I doubt not it might damage the work that those Councils do now in other directions. But at any rate it would have this advantage that it would stimulate to activity and life that body in matters educational. That is the first alternative. There is another alternative that admits a very cogent argument. You could have the local education bodies popularly elected. At any rate, whatever they spent would have the sanction of the constituency which they served.

But, my Lords, it seems to me that this Bill shows the worship of a fetish. The noble Duke kept reiterating in his speech that whatever the failure of the Bill in other respects, at any rate, it created "one authority"—there was no overlapping, no confusion, and there was "one authority." Now, what has been set up? There is first of all the Board of Education. I pass by that, because, of course, that is the highest authority, whatever is done. Then you have the local education authority; then you have the education committee; then you have the managers. Now it seems perfectly plain to me that the local education authority, which the noble Duke says will be so supreme, will have no substantial voice in the matter. I do not think it is intended to have; and I will say why—because it is the only body that is popularly elected. Now why do I think that it will have very little substantial voice? It is quite true that it will levy the rate. Well, this House has to sanction expenditure, but what authority has this House over the expenditure of the country? It can only reject Money Bills by dislocating the finances of the whole Empire. So your Lordships will find that the education committee being the persons who will spend, the local education authority, namely, the County Council, will practically have to say ditto to the expenditure and ditto to what the education committee say. And if they do not there is always the power of the Board of Education above them, which may compel them to agree with their own local education committee in matters of difference. Therefore, I say, I think it is clear that the local education authority will practically do nothing but write cheques or levy rates. It is the education committee that is the substantial body to do the work; it is that body that has to take the place of the vanished School Board. Not a single member of that body need be popularly elected—not one. And to prevent, as it seems to me, the breath of popular election from ever blowing upon these bodies, it is carefully provided that they shall come into existence before there can be any contest in the constituencies of the County Council, and before, therefore, they can ever have a chance of returning to the County Council men who may be interested in local education. Why is that? If it be desired that there should be one authority, and if the noble Duke claims that the one authority of the County Council has some popular representative instincts in it, why not arrange that the first body constituted under this Act shall be constituted after an election which has given the constituencies the power to elect persons whom they think proper to represent them upon that authority? My Lords, I cannot explain that to myself. Therefore, what we have is this, that the local education authority, upon which no single member of the County Council need compulsorily be a member, is to be the creation of a Council never elected for such a purpose, and having no popular sanction or mandate for such an election.

Then as to the term of these local education committees. Are they to be for life? No term is mentioned. Every one of the appointments of the local education committee, so far as the Act is concerned, may be for life, and so far as the Act is concerned no member need ever be a member of the Council, and no member need ever retire during the course of his natural life. It does seem to me that to suggest that such a body as this is an efficient substitute for the vanished School Board, with its popular fibre and its power of representing popular opinion, is a most extraordinary idea. Moreover, the education committee is apparently to be flooded with that precious person, the educational expert. I do not want to say anything disrespectful of the expert, but I think the educational expert is about as big a fraud as any expert in the world. Who is going to be this precious expert? He is to be a man "experienced in education"; he is to be a man "acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the area." I think I see the educational expert, and I think I see who the educational expert is meant to be. He can be nothing but the clergyman. I do not suppose there will be another man of station and position who has ever taught in the school but the clergyman, and the clergyman will undoubtedly be a man "acquainted with the needs of the various parishes in the area." And obviously what is intended is this, that the clergyman, who is not content with being the *ex officio* chairman with a casting vote upon the managers of his own school, is now, under the guise of an educational expert, to invade the managerial body of the provided school. My Lords, whether by design or not, that will possibly prevent the free expansion of work and activity of the non-sectarian schools, and will hamper the formation of schools of that class in the future.

My Lords, this Bill is designed to prevent the creation of non-sectarian schools in the future. Let us take an instance. A new school is necessary; is it to be a non-sectarian or is it to be a sectarian school? The local education authority suggest or propose that it shall be a non-sectarian school. Up jumps the clergyman and his ten ratepayers, and he proposes a sectarian school, and the appeal is made to the Board of Education. What is the Board to consider? They have got to consider firstly the interests of secular education. Well, it will be easy to show that in either case secular education will be equally good—that there will not be a pin to choose between them. Next they have got to have regard to the wishes of the parents. This is a very strange Clause; when it is suggested that on the managerial body there shall be introduced persons representing the wishes of the parents the Government object; they will not have them on the board at all; yet when they think that on the question as to whether there is to be a non-sectarian school or a sectarian school it will possibly aid in the direction of preference for a non-sectarian school, then, if you please, is called in the aid of the parents' wishes. Well, my Lords, I should think probably in those cases the wishes of the parents will be much divided, or very apathetic, and what will really dictate the choice will be the third recommendation, namely, that they shall have regard to the economy of rates. Now what is the position there? By the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897, all rates on voluntary schools are abolished, and they remain upon all others. Therefore, the first thing that will be said by the Board of Education—it must be said and ought to be said—is "We are to have regard to economy of rates; well, the law settles that for us, because if we say it shall be a non-sectarian school, the school will have to pay the rate, and if we say it is to be a sectarian school then, as a voluntary school, it need not pay any rates at all." Therefore it seems to me that that question is decided very much beforehand by the provisions of the Act. I think the probability will be that the choice will be in favour of sectarian schools.

Now the sectarian school, which is obviously intended to be the school of the future—what is it? It is managed by foundation managers. The clergyman has two votes; in nine cases out of ten by trust deed he is an *ex officio* manager, and therefore he has only to get two others to agree with him in order to carry his way. Nor will the subscribers have to pay for the privilege of controlling. It is only repairs that fall on the subscribers. They have ample funds given them by the endowments — all the endowment, if the terms of the endowment prescribe that it is to be given for the building of the school; half, if the terms are not so clear in favour of the building. They have school fees, which are paid not by themselves but by the parents; they have the rents of the teachers' houses. All these sources of income may be pooled, and therefore no subscriptions need practically be paid in the future. That is the net result of this Bill.

My Lords, I say that this Bill in the first place destroys School Boards. It deprives non-sectarian schools of any possibility of direct popular control. It quarters sectarian schools upon the public without any substantial control; and it hampers the creation of non-sectarian schools in the future. It is a step backwards and a long step backwards on the score of secondary or higher education, and I do not believe it is approved of substantially by the country.

Now, my Lords, what is the function of this House? The function of this House has been well expressed by two noble Lords now in this House. The noble Duke in the year 1893 said this—

> "It has been absolutely impossible to form any opinion as to what the real desire and wish of the people is upon this very vital question. We contend that it is a question large enough to justify us in refusing to pass this measure until the question is settled beyond the shadow of a doubt."

Then the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who of course speaks with the authority of the law, said—

> "If there is one thing which proves the absolute necessity of such an institution as the House of Lords it is that that House has given the constituencies an opportunity of making their voices heard on a matter in respect of which they have been tricked out of their votes by these men."

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The EARL of HALSBURY): Will the noble Lord say where and when those words were used?

*LORD COLERIDGE: Those words were used in this House on September 8th, 1893, and I have copied them from the authorised Report in *Hansard*. I think, my Lords, that those are very cogent arguments, and, following, not the language, but the example, set to me by those noble Lords, I must vote against the Second Reading of this Bill.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My Lords, I think it would assist us in debating this Bill if we had any confidence that the noble Lords opposite and the Opposition generally would stand by one line of argument; then we should know on what points to reply to them. There are an infinite number of cases where the diverse views held by Members of the Opposition are apparent, but I can point to one after the speech that has just been delivered by the noble Lord. He believes that the duties of the local authorities and the County Councils will practically be confined to signing cheques —I think that that was his phrase—that practically they will exercise no control, that they will look with an apathetic eye upon the operations of the education committee, and that they will supply the funds, and that will be all. Now, I have ringing in my ears a speech—I will not say where I heard it—of a very different character, where it was prognosticated that every County Council and every Urban Council would be distracted in the future by the fervid, the perfervid interest, that they would take in educational matters; that the consideration of lunatic asylums, the consideration of roads, and every other consideration would be passed over repeatedly in order to come to that most exciting and engaging topic the question of education, surrounded by a "religious atmosphere." Well, I do not know which of these two doctrines is correct. My own impression is that the local authorities to whom this duty is assigned will endeavour to perform their duties as popularly elected bodies generally perform the duties assigned to them; that is to say, with industry, and, as far as they possibly can, with impartiality. That is my view of the line which the local authorities will take.

Before I deal with the further arguments of the noble Lord, I wish to say one word upon that which I may almost call the neglected part of this great Bill, namely the part relating to secondary education. There, I frankly confess it appears to me to be more or less committing us to a leap in the dark, because we are not sufficiently informed of the ideal which the Education Department and the Government have as to what ought to be done. It has been clearly explained to us how the money is to be applied so far as it supplements existing arrangements, but the attention of the public has been so concentrated upon elementary education that I think scarcely enough attention has been given to that part of the Bill which is concerned with the great question of secondary education. Perhaps the noble Lord who represents the Department may be able to tell us something on this subject tomorrow. I should like to know more as to the goal at which they are aiming and the subjects they consider as necessary. There is a distinct indication given to the county authorities—whether it is mandatory or not, I will not argue with the noble Lord opposite—that they are to deal with secondary education; but as to when they are to consider that the supply is deficient, and upon what principles they will go in arriving at a proper supply, we are very much in the dark. I do not blame the Government with regard to it, because, if they had been invited to speak at greater length upon the subject of secondary education, no doubt they would have done so, but, to the great misfortune of the country, to the great misfortune of education, to the misfortune of all religious bodies, the subject has been so overlaid with religious controversy that some of the greatest issues connected with this Bill have necessarily been neglected and have passed out of sight. It is a matter for deep regret that this move forward in the direction of education has been clouded to the extent which it has been clouded by this fog of religious controversy. By whom has it been forced? It has been forced by that body in the country, who were deeply disappointed—I put the matter quite squarely—that the hope of the demise of the voluntary schools under financial pressure would be averted by this Bill. I am not sure that most candid Members of the Opposition would not freely confess that that was at the bottom of their opposition. They have always been conscientiously against the voluntary schools. The voluntary schools since 1870 have had a terrible struggle. They have been assisting in the education of millions of children; they have done a great work; their subscriptions have been meeting that portion of the education for which it was demanded that they should pay; but it would seem that the iron hand of financial necessity was closing round the throats of the voluntary schools, and the moment was expected when death would ensue. This Bill saves the voluntary schools from that death. It has been put before us that subscriptions were falling off. It is not the subscriptions falling off which has created so much the financial difficulties of the voluntary schools. It has been the increasing demands of the Education Department. I do not say that proper pressure was not put on, but do not let those who have supported the voluntary schools and who, in those voluntary schools, have contributed to the education, so far as they are concerned gratis, of a number of Dissenters—do not let them be told that it is on account of their illiberality that the voluntary schools have been at the point that unless they are saved by some Government money they must necessarily go to the wall. No; it has been increased pressure which has been put on by the Education Department—occasionally from fads—often from fads, but also from the demand of the country that the education should be more effective.

Now, my Lords, I speak to your Lordships tonight in the capacity of the manager of a humble parish school. I have some experience from that position which I occupy, and I know practically how matters have gone. We have been told that the voluntary schools have been under no control. I think that anybody who is the manager of a voluntary school will know what control is. They say "There is only inspection." What, "only inspection!" Why, the inspector is a despot; the inspector holds the power of the purse. Unless the local managers can satisfy the inspector the grant is cut off. They may have to dismiss their teacher. It is a fallacy—due, I think, to a want of sufficient knowledge of the practical working of these matters—to suppose that the local managers at present have been uncontrolled. They have been under the strictest possible control. We cannot have desks of any size without the inspector saying what they shall be; we cannot have hat-racks without appealing to the inspector. I myself have had to build an annexe to the school in order to have hat-racks in the cloak-room for the pupils. Of course, I was very glad to do that, but I only mention it to show how strictly we were under control. The control is so strict that I know that, in the days before the surprise visits were arranged, two or three days before the inspector came, neither the schoolmaster nor the schoolmistress could ever get a night's rest. The pressure of the school inspector was thorough and despotic. That is the control under which we have been working.

Now, my Lords, may I state what probably is new to a good many noble Lords opposite and to the public generally, that quite apart from the compulsion of the Legislature, from the very idea that it was advisable to take parents and even Dissenters into Council, there are many Boards of Management at present existing upon which Dissenters—Nonconformists—sit and act. That is so in the case of large numbers of schools. It is so in my own school. We have the vicar and myself, and we have one Churchman, and one Dissenter whom (almost *ultra vires*, against the trust deed) the vicar himself invited to take part in our deliberations because the vicar was anxious to have a representative of the Dissenters on our Board. Now that kind of spirit is supposed not to exist amongst the clergy; and I protest against the way in which the clergy have been treated in this respect. We have cases trotted out to us where clergymen have been intolerant, and no doubt there are such cases, but against that we can set off large numbers of cases in which the clergy have voluntarily asked Dissenters to act with them in managing schools where there were dissenting children. One would think, when one reads and hears all the speeches that are made, that it was a terrible grievance on the Dissenters, and that the children were all being inoculated with Anglican doctrines. How many children in our voluntary schools have been withdrawn by the parents from Church instruction on account of the teaching of Anglican doctrines? It is an infinitesimal proportion. I should like noble Lords to answer the question—Why are they not withdrawn? It it because parents have known perfectly well that common-sense and useful instruction was given to the children and that there was no reason whatever to withdraw the children. It is really almost too absurd—and one wonders what the vast body of unbelievers think when they hear of the terrors which are expressed in this matter—it is almost absurd to think that the parson and the schoolmaster are conspiring together in order to Anglicise the schools and in order to force dogmatic teaching on the children. I will give noble Lords opposite a test. Anglican schools have existed for the last thirty years, and they have become more and more active, they have become more and more alive to their duties. Have they so perverted the children generally who have been to the schools that the present generation are more dogmatically Anglican than the generation before? I dare say many a devout rector or vicar may wish that it was so, but when we know that the Anglicans have in such vast numbers had the field to themselves, the question is, have they done any damage to the children of this country? On the contrary, they have civilised them; they have increased their love for education, and they have done good in many parishes throughout the whole of this country. We hear a great deal about the "atmosphere," and the fear is expressed that the Nonconformists are not sufficiently protected in some of these schools. Well, I doubt whether it is a bad atmosphere. Sometimes one would wish that the atmosphere penetrated even more deeply than it does, but it requires a very strong atmosphere to be able to influence at least the agricultural children of this country. It will be a long time I think before dogmatic teaching sinks deeply into our agricultural population.

Then, it has been suggested this evening that the schoolmaster might belong to a different denomination, and it is considered as a reflection against the sacred doctrine of the abolition of tests that teachers should belong to the denomination of which the school is. Now I want to know something about that. At all events I have a clear record—I ought to have a clear record, in the eyes of Nonconformists, for I myself took the main part in the abolition of tests in the Universities as Member for Oxford a great many years ago. Therefore I have got absolutely no anti-Nonconformist views in regard to this question. But common-sense would tell you that you should prefer to have in your school a teacher belonging to the denomination to which your school belongs. Take Wesleyan schools. I should like to know is there one single Wesleyan school where they have a Churchman as a master? I have never heard of one. It is said we have to deal with the teaching of our children, and we have got to think of the wishes of the parents. I heard the statement last night that parents really had nothing to say in this matter—that, as the State pays, the State should decide as to what is for the good of the community. But I hold the more old-fashioned doctrine that parents have still something to say as to the education of their children. I believe that the great majority of the parents would wish that the schoolmaster should belong to the community which they belong to themselves, and that, therefore, where there is a great majority they would themselves prefer that the majority should select the teacher.

My Lords, I pass from that subject to a question which I confess is very obnoxious to me. It is a question that has been argued in your Lordships' House tonight, and which has been argued in the country, and it is this: What is the loss and the gain to the Church through this Bill? What is the loss and gain to the Nonconformists through this Bill? It has become almost absolutely indispensable to deal with this question, on account of the manifold misrepresentations which are made with regard to this Bill. One would think, listening to the speeches, not so much the lamb-like and more innocent speeches that are made in your Lordships' House, but speeches that are made elsewhere and on the platform, that positively this Bill threw back the position of the Nonconformists with regard to the control of our schools, and that the Church would have the schools more in their own hands than they had before—that this was a reactionary measure, and that it was a surrender of popular control. Why, my Lords, looking at it from the point of view of the school manager, we may gain in money, but we lose largely in control. We lose more in control than, as a school manager deeply interested in the school, I myself like to contemplate. It is a heavy price that the managers of the voluntary schools have to pay for the financial relief which this Bill is to give them. I only trust that the enactments which have been made may not diminish the local interest of the school managers, which is essential for the well-conducting of these schools. You may lay down your syllabuses and your books; you may lay down your programme and the number of your teachers, centrally or by an education committee; still the managers have got to see that it is all carried out, and they have got to see what influence they can bring to bear upon the whole tone of the school. That is a matter that has scarcely been touched upon in any of the discussions upon this Bill. The question of the tone of the school has been entirely ignored—as if you could separate absolutely secular education from religious education—and there has been the fear that some little breath of religious education might unfortunately permeate into secular education.

Well, my Lords, it is, I confess very difficult to separate the two, but now let me take the secular education in the first place. I have, I hope, proved conclusively that, as it is, the school managers have not been uncontrolled; that if they had Government money there was Government control—continuous, formal, effective Government control—payment by results being the result of inspection. The powers which have been exercised by the school managers are now to be transferred practically to the education committees. I do not quite know how that will work in detail, but hitherto under the Code the school managers have managed the books and the times of the school, within certain limits the subjects, the degree of interest to be given to each, and especially I may mention the syllabuses—the books. Noble Lords tonight have said: "Oh, there will be no really effective control taken away from the managers." I say that all control is taken away. It is said: "Oh, you will be able to dismiss or to appoint the teachers." You cannot dismiss the teachers. The local authority has a veto upon that. The local authority can coerce the local managers almost in every conceivable educational point. Noble Lords opposite, and those who oppose this Bill, may be delighted at that result; it will be taken away from "those incompetent school managers"—men who have loved their schools, who have supported them for thirty years, but who are to be displaced now by those who dislike denominational education, and wish to substitute a different system for it. They are to be displaced. Their power is to be transferred to the local authorities. Dissenters say that this is a Church Bill, and that it is the Church that gains. But the fact is, that popular control over secular education is under this Bill effectively, decidedly, and widely transferred to the local authorities.

Now, my Lords, the school managers are to have two members appointed beyond their own four. I should like to know who those two are likely to be—I mean, not the persons, but the class. I can conceive two different theories. I can conceive the theory — and this is the theory which is put forward by the belligerent and aggressive Nonconformists—that if there were a Nonconformist, or a secular, or a Cowper-Temple majority on some of the County Councils, they would put on two men on purpose to represent that side. If controversy is to be the guiding factor in the appointment of the two additional school managers, then, indeed, I fear there will be friction beyond end, and I fear efforts may be made to wreck those results which every patriotic citizen would desire to see following from this Bill. But I do not think that that need be the interpretation put upon it. The interpretation I should myself wish to see put upon it is that in choosing the two managers who are to be added to the four the governing idea would be some view to local considerations. If there was a considerable body of Dissenters, a Dissenter should be put on, not to fight but to co-operate; a parent should be put on to put forward his views, not to create friction but to avoid friction; and from that point of view (as noble Lords have seen from the experiments which I mentioned as having been tried in my own parish and which have been tried elsewhere) the addition of others is useful. But at all events there you have the successive loss of power—some of it right, some of it perhaps wrong—from the school managers. You lose your sole control, because two others are to be put on the school managing committee from outside. You have no power left, but the whole power of the six is to be transferred to the education committee. Therefore I say that, as regards secular education, with all the powers reserved for the education committee and ultimately for the County Councils, to say that this Bill is conceived in opposition to popular control is as great a perversion of the truth as has ever been made by a partizan, a pamphleteer, or a controversialist on the platform, or by any other person. It is absolutely untrue. The position is there. We are saved by the finance, but we are saved to continue a precarious existence under the absolute control of popularly elected bodies.

There is one point that strikes me incidentally. Besides having the two additional members joined on to the four who, I will say, belong to us, are we to have inspectors appointed by the local authority? I have heard nothing about that. I do not know whether the noble Lord who represents the Department will be able to tell us more about that.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: The authority may inspect.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: Yes, they may inspect, and a pretty inspection that will be. We have already got the Government Inspector. Now we are going to have two despots—the central despot and the local despot. Whether there will be the slightest harmony between the local despot and the central despot is a question which I should be very sorry to answer, except as expressing my conviction that they are certain not entirely to agree. And who is to overrule? That is a point that has not been explained at all. Suppose the local inspector says: "I will not have such and such a book: that book is a bad one; it is ineffective; it does not represent the popular view of history or geography"—(perhaps there will be more difference as to history than as to geography!)—who is to decide between the two? And there will be the wretched school managers who are to be inspected by a local inspector who will tell them that something is all wrong; they meet his views; then the Government Inspector comes down and tells them that it is all right. And the Government Inspectors are not always consistent; one inspector does not always take the same view as another inspector. On that subject I could tell your Lordships some doleful tales; it is one of those factors which has assisted in ruining the finances of the voluntary schools. I myself have had an experience in that direction. Pictures were ordered at great cost on the representation of some inspector; they were bought; the children were excellently taught according to those pictures by object lessons, and so forth. (Noble Lords will excuse me if my nomenclature is not absolutely correct. Then a new inspector was appointed, and he came down and said: "All that is too much advanced; you are trying the brains of the infants too much; they answer the questions very well, but they are too advanced, and you must have a totally different set of pictures." Well, my Lords, that is very trying to voluntary school finances. But I want to know is that going to be a danger to which local finance is to be exposed in the future? What are to be the relations between the central Department and the local authorities? Will the central Department treat the local authorities with a little more deference than they have treated the school managers, and will they treat them all alike? Will they be able to maintain the uniformity which hitherto they have in vain attempted to secure through the inspectors? Will they be able to attain it through their popularly elected local bodies? That is a question that the future will have to decide; but I must say that I think the question of double inspection is one which really demands consideration, because it may expose the whole system to a very considerable degree of pressure.

My Lords, I pass from the question of secular education to the very difficult question of religious education. Here I would deprecate in the strongest possible manner the attempts which have been made, I do not say directly, but impliedly, or perhaps I should say the tone which has been adopted, regarding the close connection of the clergy with these schools. I think that that close connection is of the greatest importance. It may be necessary to check the excesses of a certain class of parsons who bring obloquy on the whole body of the clergy—an obloquy which ought to restrain them, whatever their convictions may be. The whole tone of the debates in another place, and of many speeches on the platform—in fact, I am not sure that it has not penetrated even within these walls tonight—is this! the clergyman is a rather dangerous man as regards the school. Heaven forbid that such a view as that should penetrate the public opinion of the country! It would be a calamity if it were so, as the reverse is the case. The men who are to be checked by the Kenyon-Slaney Clause are, as was extremely well put by my noble friend Lord Lansdowne, a very, very small minority, but, of course, what they do is exaggerated in public opinion, and put forward as if it were the practice of the clergy at large. I say without hesitation that some of them, very extreme men, are *pseudo-*Anglicans, but they are worse than that in one respect, for they are also *pseudo-*Romanists, because they will not submit to the discipline which the Romanists would exact from any recalcitrant clergyman. They claim the licence of the English Church, while they put forward doctrines which are not the doctrines of the English Church. I think, and I say so frankly, that they have done incalculable harm to the clergy at large, and I regret it with a regret the depth of which I cannot express, because, I hold, on the other hand, that the Church during recent years has developed a vigorous life under feelings of enthusiasm which has been of the greatest advantage to the country at large. We no longer have the cold clergy of a certain number of years ago. There are men—a good many perhaps—who would prefer to have the cold, easy-going rector or vicar of, say, thirty years ago; they would prefer not to see men who are meddling far beyond their own school. Meddling? No, moulding, often, the civilisation of their parishes, and they would prefer to see quieter men.

Now, my Lords, there is one thing which is as certain as anything in the world, and that is, that for all great movements—for life itself—you want enthusiasm. The reason I resent the excesses of fanatics is that it brings a certain amount of obloquy on enthusiasts. What have not the enthusiasts amongst the clergy done during these last years? The Right Rev. Prelate the Archbishop of Canterbury has spoken of their services and their pecuniary sufferings, but what have they not done in the way of assisting, apart from their own pulpits, the cause of civilisation in crowded towns? Think of the occupation of these men—you will see why I ask you to think of it in a moment. Their occupation in the large towns, and to a certain extent in the country also, is what? They have to wage a terrible fight. They have to fight barbarism, darkness, sin, poverty, all in their vilest shapes. Day after day these devoted men are struggling in the performance of that sacred duty as soldiers of the Cross. But there is one redeeming duty that they have to discharge. What is that redeeming duty? It is that of looking after their schools. I am told that from all these sights and from all this work among the depraved, the poor, and the unbelieving, where they are fighting a hopeless battle, they come to their school, and it is in the school that they see the hope of the regeneration of the next generation. It is in the innocent, or the comparatively innocent, children whom they have before them that they see some consolation, some privilege, some redeeming feature in their terrible and sombre work. I say that to discourage these men would be a calamity. There is one right rev. Prelate, at any rate, who well knows what these things are. The Right Rev. the Bishop of London has been in the East End of London; he knows what are the duties of the clergy there and what their miseries are. If the result of these debates was to cast a slur upon the clergy, or cause suspicions to be expressed towards them, because in their zeal they wish to retain some command and some control over their schools, it would be a great pity. Let us not begrudge them this task, associated as they will be with the managers. Do not let us put enactments into a Bill which would seem to imply that the clergy of the country are not to be trusted with that which is their sacred duty, and which they have hitherto attempted to discharge, viz., their work in moulding the hearts and souls of the young.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, if I may say so without offence, it seems to me that the motor muscle of the eloquent speech to which we have just listened is the happy experiences which the noble Viscount has had owing to his influence with those with whom he has had to do in the management of a voluntary school. I should like to say here that I do not think the experiences he has related to us are exceptional. I am a manager of a voluntary school myself, and I think most people know the difficulty of scraping together subscriptions and keeping up to the mark. I hope I love my school as much as the noble Viscount loves his, but I confess, like the fat boy in "Pickwick," that the noble Viscount made my flesh creep when he spoke of all the new difficulties with which we should be faced under the Bill, a Bill which I agree with him falls far short of an ideal Bill in its management Clauses with regard to voluntary schools. I think we all admire the rather Salvator Rosa-ish picture which he drew of the devotion of the clergy, but I must say, for my own part, that I disassociate myself altogether from the picture he drew of people on this side of the House who take a different view of the clergy from that held by himself.

I confess, my Lords, that I thought the whole area of this subject had been explored, and that there was very little new for anybody to say. The speech of the noble Viscount, however, has wonderfully fertilised the ground, and I have no doubt that in the debate tomorrow he will hear a good many points made, not perhaps against, but at any rate suggested by the points he has made so admirably tonight.

I do not want to give a silent vote on this Bill, because up in the West Riding we do not think much of it, and in that part of the world we are pretty stiff in our convictions. Mr. Fox said that by being a good Churchman you might become a bad citizen. Speaking for myself, I hope I am a good Churchman; I always listen to the right rev. Bench with interest, and very often with acceptance; I read the lives of great Churchmen, and I approve of a Parliamentary religion. Perhaps, in view of some of the provisions of the scheme now before us, the measure of my approval of a Parliamentary religion is to some extent the measure of my disapproval of the Bill.

The noble Viscount expressed the wish that people on this side of the House would confine themselves to some main ground of objection. I will endeavour to conform to that wish. My main ground of objection to the Bill is that instead of giving us a great educational measure, it seems to me that, as regards voluntary schools, the Government are giving us an Ecclesiastical Instrument. Speaking for myself, I do not want to be taken back to the days of Bishop Jewell, who, putting it generally, held that the voice of the Church was to be held superior to the voice of reason. Nor do I wish to be taken back to the days of tests. Nor am I prepared to be satisfied with a very weak dose of education in what seems to me to be a strong decoction of denominational teaching and local government. I do not know what are the general views of the noble Viscount on the Bill, but, as far as I could see, his happy experiences as a manager of a voluntary school led him to make something very like an attack in force on the management Clauses of the measure, and he has made it quite clear that he does not approve very much of what I was prepared to say a good word for, namely, the secondary education parts of the Bill. As he is a staunch supporter of His Majesty's Government I will not say what I was going to say, but will accept his adverse criticism that this matter ought to have been looked into much more closely than it was.

Now, the main line of defence in the speeches both of the noble Duke who introduced the Bill, and of the Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury was that the measure co-ordinated education. All through these debates I have noticed that the word "co-ordination" is a sort of "Mesopotamia" which gets people out of difficulties—or into them. The Prime Minister stated the other day that secondary and elementary education were to be indivisible halves of one great whole, and that one authority was to be responsible for education, for rating, and for administering monies within its area. This body, as we know, is, as the case may be, either the Town or the County Council. What does that mean? It is a body elected, in both cases, for quite different duties both in kind and in degree. These bodies, again to quote the Prime Minister, are now

> "constituted by Act of Parliament in a true and real sense the arbiters of education in the area of control."

I suppose—and here I find myself in tolerable agreement with the noble Viscount—that that practically means the extinction as a very active force of the old Board of Education. But what is this co-ordination? I would like the noble Duke to tell us whether I should be co-ordinating my affairs if I suddenly bade my agent, whom I had engaged to look after my planting, my draining, and my estate accounts, to choose the governess for the young ladies, to suggest the course of their education, and to select the "coaches" and the public schools to which the young gentlemen of my family were to be a credit. And, to follow out the metaphor, if I were to do this, I should, of course, have to abdicate all control myself, and to pay the piper for a tune I did not call. I do not know whether or not that is co-ordination, but that seems to me to be the position in which you are placing these local authorities. They were elected for quite a different set of duties, and suddenly they are told they are to undertake the education of the country. Far be it from me to speak lightly of local authorities of any sort. I preside over the cautious operation of a Parish Council, and I belong to the London County Council. I hope, without any disrespect to the London County Council, I may say here that when the time comes to deal with London, I should feel much more easy if I saw the London County Council entrusted with the making and the working—certainly the working—of tube railways than if I saw them appointed sole arbiters of elementary education. However, co-ordination is to be the new basis and the progressive force of education. The Primate laid great stress on the advantages which this Bill offered for securing efficiency in every part. Here I would like to ask whether you will get much co-ordination in a lean clay country, with agricultural wages of perhaps 14s. a week, an impoverished body of ratepayers, and a gentry very much out at elbow? Are their views and action in matters of education likely to be the same as those of, say, the County Council of the West Riding? I do not think they are. But I will pass from that. I am afraid it is impossible to find any fresh ground, so I will take up a matter touched upon by Lord Coleridge. He asked, what is the immediate contribution to the increased efficiency of education under this Bill? In the first place—and I am talking now of the towns—with provided schools—I see that the School Boards are to be abolished, they are to be co-ordinated out of existence. Everybody, I believe, pays tribute to the good work they have done, and Lord Spencer put before us very clearly what this abolition of the School Boards means, viz., the great loss to the country of a volume of expert, trained, and devoted service. It is quite true that by the grace and favour of the new agencies created by the Bill, the members of School Boards may be appointed as nominees, or they may be willing to stand the racket of a municipal election. But will they care to stand that racket? I do not know that they will; they may have no taste for sewers, lamp-posts, highways, or lunatic asylums; and I am bound to say that it seems a most extraordinary start to make, especially at a time when there is a sort of *actum est de republicâ* complexion about every expert on education, owing to our want of education. We are told that we are being beaten in the markets of the world, although the doctors differ as to whether it is due to bad elementary education or to the want of secondary education. We are told that it is quite as much for one or other reason as by our partiality for high wages, short hours, and plenty of rational amusement. I confess that I feel no confidence in this sudden flinging of ourselves educationally on the municipal bosom, this shedding, as it were, of tried and trained servants. Even in the case of the voluntary schools, which the noble Viscount tells us are to be saved under this Bill, I feel only a qualified alleviation of this anxiety when I know that the new system is to be inaugurated, protected, nurtured, and perfected by the oversight of the right rev. Prelates from their bishoprics, and by the inspired efforts of the foundation managers on the spot, of whom, with any ordinary luck, I hope to be one.

Some time ago—but not very long—the Primate levelled at His Majesty's Government the suggestion that they were not a very brave Government. I do not think that anybody will say that now. They have got rid of School Boards; they have pouched—that is not a very nice word—they have collared the endowments—I cannot find quite the right word. ["Appropriated." "Commandeered."] Well, they have appropriated the endowments; they draw the rent for teachers' houses; they have assigned fees in relief of subscriptions: they have renewed tests; and they have unhorsed that venerable maxim that representation and taxation should go together. It is a long time since the Primate—he was then Dr. Temple—used these words (I am speaking of the Commission of 1858)—

> "I should leave the parents of the children to determine the religious character which a public school should have."

At the same time, he deprecated the spreading influence of a particular denomination, and said that the religious zeal of that particular denomination was very unhealthy. These voluntary schools now become public schools. And what did the Primate do not very long ago? He warned the voluntary schools against getting on "the slippery slope of rate aid." He said that that would be the end of them. But to-night he has told us that the Bill is a very fine thing for the voluntary schools because they will get off the uncertain basis of voluntary subscriptions by receiving rate aid. I think the Primate was quite right. He never thought—I do not suppose that anyone did at that time—that a Bill of this sort would be brought in. Mr. Haldane, who is a stalwart for the Bill, writes in one of the most influential of the magazines, that Ministers have been "brokers in this matter between Educationalists and the Church." If that is the case, I am bound to say that I do not think the people of this country, or a very large section of them, will be much inclined to employ them again as brokers.

Now I will turn to the education to be provided by Part III. of the Bill. I said at the beginning of my remarks that we had a very strong decoction of what I will call religious politics as against very little about education. In the statement as to the weak dose of education pure and simple, I find I may claim the support of the Prime Minister. Speaking at the Guildhall recently, he said that questions of religion and local government had been a great deal discussed in these debates, but he could not remember much time being given to education. I do not think that that was due to any defect in the Prime Minister's memory; the defect is in his Bill. The fact is, the Bill provides very little for the educationalist to say. Part III. all refers to local government. What do all these Clauses and sub-Sections work up to? Implicitly to the generating of a religious atmosphere, and to keeping it at a particular pitch. In Shakespeare's line—

> "The why is plain as way to Parish Church.

It is, as I said just now, the machinery of an Ecclesiastical Instrument. When I first obtained the Bill I looked feverishly through it for something to do with education. The only thing I could find was hidden away in Clause 23, the definition Clause, which, I believe, was closured, and there I found that the mixture is as before, but it is to be made up by fresh chemists, put into new bottles, and labelled with—what shall I call it?—a clergy or bishop's brand. No doubt, here and there, through the Bill you get a glance of that now attenuated organism the Board of Education, a vision of its former self. I quite agree with Lord Goschen that we used to be very much afraid of the Board of Education; it kept us up to the mark very well, particularly in the days of Mr. Acland, and really I, as a manager of a voluntary school, was always afraid to open my letters. Now, as I understand, the Board of Education is only to be called in to give ticklish judgments on the thorny complications which abound throughout this Bill. I am glad to be able to congratulate my old friend Lord Londonderry on looking in health and spirits; he does not appear to feel his situation at all. I am sure he will manage the business very well and that he will steer with ability between the Scylla of the Secular and the Charybdis of the Church controversialists.

I have always noticed that the danger of a Second Reading speech is that, if you look at the Clauses at all, you are told that you ought to reserve your observations until the Committee stage, while if you do not look at the Clauses you are said to be shirking the Bill. I will do a little of both, and get off as lightly as I can. I followed very carefully, and agreed with a great deal of the speech of the noble Viscount with regard to Clause 7. It seems to me an extraordinary Clause. The local authority are to tell the managers what to teach, they are to tell them the right sort of man to teach it, in some cases they can appoint and not dismiss, in other cases they can affirm a dismissal but have nothing to do with the appointment; they are to act on their own views, and yet there is no sort of obligation laid upon them so far as I can see from the Clause, to take any expert advice on the subject. They will have an Education Committee, but I do not know that they are bound to act on its advice. How are they to know all this? Are they to know it by the light of Nature? As Lord Spencer has said, the authority may be some fifty or seventy miles away from the scene of operations; how are they to know all about these matters? I suppose the anonymous letter writer, who always plays a great part in this sort of affair, will come out and inform them of what is going on.

Then I come to the very thing of which Lord Goschen made such a strong point. The local authority can inspect. What are they going to inspect? Will they inspect log-books or lavatories? No doubt these are very good things in their way to inspect, but they will not get you on much educationally. And how do they inspect—like the Government inspector? Lord Goschen asked all these questions and I should very much like to have an answer to them. I quite agree, as far as I read the Clause, it gives the local authority only an enabling power; it does not oblige them to inspect. I can quite see that if they exercise their enabling power they may come into collision with the inspector under the Education Department. I hope we shall have some answers to these questions to-morrow. It seems to me that out of this Clause 7, the local authority and the foundation managers, the noble Marquess and the

Board of Education will emerge with very confused notions of their relative powers and duties and possbilities, but, I think, with very firm convictions that they will have endless opportunities of treading on each other's toes.

I agree that probably all these things will work out. *Solvitur ambulando* is a maxim which applies with wonderfully happy and practical results to English affairs, but I am not so sure about the religious difficulty. Sir John Gorst, whose utterances on education everybody reads with interest, has said that the religious difficulty flourishes only on the floor of Parliament and on the platform. I used to think so myself, but I must say that the course of this Bill through Parliament and the feeling which it has aroused in the country make me think it will flourish anywhere if you give it a chance—and I am afraid His Majesty's Government have given it that chance. You have provided us, as somebody has said, with bickerings for ten years to come. The administrative part of the Bill teems with occasions for friction and misunderstanding. The religious atmosphere that you have created —and this I think is the most serious part of all—divides Church and Nonconformity into standing camps, and remits to the Greek Kalends the *concordat* which I think all sincere people, whatever their views on the matter, really desired to see arrived at.

Now why do I say this? I was very glad to hear the Duke of Devonshire speak quite openly of the tests. I say it because implicity and explicity throughout the Bill, you have re-imposed tests. You have Church of England managers for the non-provided schools, and it is clear that the head teachers in these schools also will be Church of England men. I quite admit the toleration of the secondary education part of the Bill, but I adhere to my view that the tests of the elementary part are in a form which is justifiably very unpopular and alarming to a large section of the people of the country. By the Bill it is clear that the seed ground of doctrinal teaching is to be children under fifteen years of age. After that, I suppose they are considered to be immune, unless during that period they have come under the influence of some infidel pupil teacher or assistant teacher, and this brings out how clearly it is meant that the head-teacher should be a Church of England man.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Is that in Clause 15?

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: No, my 15 has to do with age. I will give the Clause. I said you were a bold Government. In Clause 7, sub-Section 4, you have been sufficiently brave to define the age of denominational puberty. You say that the pupil teacher and the assistant teacher may be anything you please; it is only the head teacher about whom you are particular?

I have here several sincere questions which I wish to put to the noble Duke. I want to ask him about the head teacher. What are the tests? What is required to constitute membership of the Church of England as by this Bill established? Is it the test of Baptism? If so, would baptism by a Nonconformist minister be valid?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Where does the Bill say anything about tests?

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: I say that tests are provided for.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Where?

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: Explicitly by the operation of your Bill.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Where?

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: You prescribe that the pupil teacher may be anything you like; you make the foundation managers Church of England people. The trust deeds of voluntary schools always affirm that, so that naturally your foundation managers will be Church of England people, unless you go against the trust deeds, which I do not believe that even this courageous Government mean to do. I say that explicitly by the operation of the Bill, and implicitly by its wording, you re-impose tests, and the noble Duke all through his speech spoke of the tests of the Bill. What I want to know is how we arrive at the test. Is it the test of baptism? Is it the test of confirmation?

Is it the test of attendance at Holy Communion ? Is the attendance to be regular or occasional, or is it to be according to the Prayer-book, that every parishioner should communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter is to be one ?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ONSLOW) : Is this in the Bill ?

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : I am asking all these questions of the Government. If you are so keen on having Church of England teachers, how do you satisfy yourselves that they are Church of England teachers ?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE : The managers will do that.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : Who is to certify that they are members of the Church of England ? Is there to be any certificate ?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE : The managers will attend to that.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : Is it to be on the affidavit of the managers, like Lord Rosebery's German waiter ?

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY : The managers have the power of appointing, subject to the control of the county authority.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : Supposing that under the trust deed people are not satisfied with the appointment on the ground that the person appointed is not what they conceive to be a member of the Church of England ; whether he is a manager or a teacher, who is to decide the point ?

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY : Four managers are appointed by the trust deed.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : But I am talking of the test which you apply to the teachers.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY : I think there is some misunderstanding. There is no test applied to the teachers. The appointment of teachers rests in the hands of the managers. The trust deed appoints four of those managers to be of the same denomination as that to which the school belongs, and the other two are appointed by the local authority. Therefore, the majority, with the Chairman—who is understood to be the clergyman—will have the appointment of the teacher who is supposed to represent their own religious teaching.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE : Of course I must accept the explanation of the noble Marquess, who is at the head of the Board of Education, and probably knows the points to which I am referring. I really did not know of whom to ask these questions ; whether of the noble Duke or the noble Marquess, or the right rev. Bench or Lord Hugh Cecil, or Mr. Lloyd-George.

Enough of that. It seems to me that, while it is the duty of the State to educate all alike in secular affairs and good citizenship, those higher duties which we associate with religion should be learnt elsewhere, and that the clergy of all denominations are the proper persons to teach them. That is my individual opinion. Having regard to the majority which His Majesty's Government enjoys in the House of Commons, and to its dictatorship in the House of Lords, and having regard especially to the resolute, yet flexible, mind and high statesmanship of the Prime Minister, I wish that before the right hon. Gentleman had put his hand to drafting this Bill he had tried to arrange a conference with Nonconformists and Leaders of the Church. I believe tha by that means a *concordat* might have been arrived at, towards the bringing about of which his own tact and ability would have done wonders. However, that has not been done, and there is nothing more to be said about it.

I also wish that with the special advantages enjoyed by His Majesty's Government the opportunity had been taken to work the teachers connected with elementary education into a sort of national Civil Service, with its possibilities of promotion. That, of course, would have had to be in the hands of local authorities, for I cannot conceive that in these days, even a Government endowed with the courage and the advantages of the present Administration, would have dared to impose religious tests upon a branch of the Civil Service. But, after all, these are, so to speak, only alternative kites, which contribute nothing to a Second Reading debate. I merely express my regret that nothing was done to bring the teachers into a national Civil Service, and that before you put your hands to the draft of this Bill no steps were taken in an endeavour to arrive at a *concordat.*

In conclusion, my Lords, I disagree with this Bill on three main grounds, which leave me very little to agree with. I disagree with it because, by doing away with School Boards you are depriving education of the directly elected services of trained and devoted educational experts. My second ground of disagreement is, that you are ignoring the necessity—as I think, the proved - to - demonstration necessity—of a central educational force, such as the old Board of Education. My third ground of disagreement is that by the provisions of this Bill for the non-provided—that is, the old voluntary—schools you are re-affirming tests. In 1827, on the repeal of the Tests Act, Lord John Russell wrote to Moore " of the joy of having forced the enemy from his first line, that none but Churchmen were worthy to serve the State." Lady Spencer, who, I believe was grandmother of the noble Earl who leads us on this side of the House, wrote Lord John, from the experience of a long life passed in the heart of public affairs, congratulating him on the relief of Dissenters, and predicting a concurrence and unanimity of intelligence and enterprise which would be brought to the service of the State. My Lords, would that this union and consent of heart and mind had been evident in the course of this Bill, and in a great portion of the country. Would that the Bill had not by its provisions laid down that none but Churchmen are worthy to serve the State in half the elementary schools of the country in the high cause of education. Unfortunately, the right rev. Prelates, His Majesty's Government, and the exigencies of the situation as regards the great difficulties in which the voluntary schools found themselves, have willed it otherwise, and we are now asked to give a Second Reading to a Bill which throws education into the arena of religious politics, quarters the whole, or nearly the whole, cost upon the people at large, and sets at naught some of those principles which we have held to be more or less sacred since the day of Ship Money. As far as I am concerned, I shall vote with cheerful conviction against the Second Reading of such a measure.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, if I may attempt to summarise the interesting but somewhat discursive speech to which we have just listened, I think I may take it that the noble Lord regards this Bill as an ecclesiastical instrument. I think he said further that it was a religious decoction with an episcopal label. Without pursuing those remarks, I would like to answer one observation which he made towards the conclusion of his speech, viz., " That this Bill re-affirms tests." I am utterly at a loss to understand what he means by that statement. So far as I have read the Bill, and I have read it very carefully, there is nothing in the Bill about tests of any sort or kind. The fact to which I presume he was referring was that the headmasters in voluntary schools under trust deeds are to be members of the Church of England. But, my Lords, the test, if the noble Lord likes to use that word, is contained not in this Bill, but in the trust deed, and, so far from re-affirming tests, all that this Bill does is to leave the trust deed in that respect exactly as it now stands.

The noble Lord, in the course of his speech, said very little directly about voluntary schools. I venture to submit that in considering either this or any other Bill dealing with education in England and Wales, it is impossible to arrive at any useful conclusion unless you always keep in mind the existing condition of things with regard to education. You must remember this, that 15,000 out of 20,000 are voluntary schools, and that in them are educated more than half the children of England. If, therefore, you propose to consider the educational position and leave out of account the voluntary schools, you are looking at only half the situation. The board schools are supported by the rates, and no doubt educate nearly half the children in England, but there are a large number of people who are not satisfied with the religious education which is perfectly satisfactory to Lord Spencer and many others. How is it possible or practical to put forward a proposition ignoring the voluntary schools? We hear talk about buying up the voluntary schools, or of leasing them from people who do not want to let them, or of establishing board schools in every parish in England. Phrases of that sort are all very well for the platform, but for any purpose other than that of mere declamation they are perfectly idle, and will not stand examination.

There is another point which, in considering this Bill, I think we ought to keep before us. I am addressing myself now more particularly to those who support voluntary schools, and especially the ecclesiastical supporters of those schools. We must remember that there is all the difference in the world between a school and a church. The primary object of Church schools as laid down in the trust deeds is to give education. The religious education given in those schools is the secondary and not the primary object of their existence. Therefore, for anyone to talk about shutting up these schools because the religious teaching is not to be given solely by the clergyman or exactly in the way that he suggests seems to me to be a very unfortunate position for the Church to take up. If the mischievous advice—for I must call it mischievous—which I have heard given at some meetings and in some speeches were to be adopted, viz., that the Church schools should be closed, you may depend upon it that that would be a most unfortunate course of ,action for the Church, and would do more to undermine her authority than any other course of conduct that could be pursued.

The Government have been found fault with for bringing forward this Bill, on the ground that they had no mandate to do anything of the kind. I was very glad to hear that Lord Spencer, at all events, made no allegation of that kind. We all know that the Education question is a pressing question, and we know also that is an extremely dangerous question for any Government to touch. The history of the Education question since 1870 may be stated in a very few words. In 1870, board schools were established, rate aid was first given, and grants were made to voluntary and other schools as they were earned. From that day to this, as was said by Lord Goschen to-night, the requirements of the Education Department have been constantly on the increase. Different Governments have increased the grants, but the requirements have increased to an even greater extent. I do not find any fault with those increasing requirements. It is no doubt necessary that the standard of education should be higher, but, at the same time, voluntary aid and liberality can go only a certain distance, and that is the position in which you find yourselves at the present time. It simply comes to this: Are you going to strike out these voluntary schools altogether? If you are not prepared to do that—and I do not believe it would be seriously proposed, certainly not by any responsible Government—what other course have you except that of giving aid from the rates. Whatever you may say of this Bill—you may say it is not perfect, or that it does not provide a complete solution of the question, or other general remarks of that kind which are, no doubt, to a considerable extent true—will anyone say that it is not a considerable advance? I am not going through the Bill. The noble Duke, in introducing this measure, enumerated various points in which this Bill wrought changes in the educational system of this country. You must at all events concede that one authority is created, that the Bill for the first time draws a distinction in accordance with the Cockerton judgment, between elementary and secondary education, and that the question of an undenominational training college for teachers is to a large extent, if not completely, settled.

Turning now to the enactments of the Bill, the complaint I have to raise against the measure is that it does not enable the local authority which it professes to trust to inquire into the small schools. Your Lordships will remember that the whole principle of the Bill is to set up this local authority, to give it all the income, to give it all the powers over the Committee, to give it powers over the managers, and over every department of education. The Government say the local authority may raise the question of whether schools are necessary, but the moment you come to the smallest schools, viz., those with an attendance of thirty or so, they are to be considered necessary and into these schools there is to be no inquiry. I think I may fairly ask what is the reason for such an enactment as that? *Prima facie*, it seems to me absolutely contrary to the principle of the Bill. You propose to trust the local authority; why, then, is the local authority not to inquire into the schools which, of all schools, most require to be inquired into? You are placing, for the first time, the schools of the county on the county. You are going to say that these schools are to be kept up for all time out of the county rate. It seems to me that of all the schools that should be inquired into these are the very schools into which it is most desirable the local authority should be authorised to inquire.

There is another matter, but one which does not, perhaps, so much affect this House, viz., the financial question. After considerable examination, it appears to me that the financial terms of the Bill are most unfortunate. Let me for a moment remind your Lordships of what the present system of finance is—the system laid down by the Act of 1870. In the first place, you had the subscriptions; these are paid by the owners. In the next place you had the grants earned by the school. The subscriptions and grants are all paid to the managers. If anything further is required it falls upon the managers to collect the money in the best way they can. In that way managers have a very considerable position and a large financial responsibility. But what do you do by this Bill? You entirely destroy the parish as the financial unit created by the Act of 1870. All the grants are paid over, not to the managers of the school by which they were earned, but direct to the local authority. The managers have no income, because, of course, subscriptions have entirely disappeared. No one will subscribe when he has not the remotest idea as to where his money will go. The income of the managers will consist merely of whatever the local authority chooses to give them. The local authority is bound, it is true, to maintain the school, but there is nothing whatsoever in the Bill to indicate that if a school under the managers earns a good grant, that grant, or any fixed proportion of it, shall be paid to the managers. In this way, it appears to me that you do away with all individual interest in the schools. What interest will a schoolmaster any longer have in getting a high grant? He will have no knowledge of what becomes of it when earned. What interest will the managers have? It matters not to them. So long as the school attains the standard of educational proficiency, whatever it may be, fixed by the local authority, they will receive the cost of maintenance, and that is all they will get.

Then, not merely that, my Lords, but for the first time you introduce a county rate. You place this charge upon the county instead of the parish, and you place it upon the occupiers instead of the owners. I have looked into a great many cases, and in a certain number of agricultural parishes it came to what amounted to nearly 5d. in the £. If you put on a county rate of 5d. in the £, depend upon it you will hear a great deal from the occupiers of land. Besides that, you are really attacking the basis on which all English rating rests.

The next question on which I wish to address your Lordships is as to what really will be the cost under this Bill. That is a question which no human being can answer. There is a reference in the Bill to a threepenny rate. I remember that in the discussions on the Education Bill of 1870, the late Mr. Forster spoke of a threepenny rate. A threepenny rate! All that we know about the various financial calculations made in connection with Education Bills is that they have invariably been exceeded—exceeded not merely to a small extent, but in some cases doubled or even trebled. Clause 10 (*b*) is a financial conundrum. I do not know whether any of your Lordships have read it, but I should like to know whether either the noble Duke or the noble Marquess can interpret it. It is this: "In lieu of the aid grant you are to receive a sum equal to 4s. per scholar." That I understand. Then you are to receive—

> "an additional sum of three-halfpence per scholar for every complete twopence per scholar by which the amount which would be produced by a penny rate on the area of the authority falls short of ten shillings a scholar; provided that in estimating the produce of a penny rate in the area of a local education authority not being a county borough the rate should be calculated on the county rate basis . . . ."

Then the Clause, which, up to this point, has dealt, or professes to deal, only with the aid grant, bursts out into a general disquisition on grants, and says—

> "But if in any year the total amount of Parliamentary grants payable to a local educational authority would make the amount payable out of other sources by that authority on account of their expenses under Part III. of this Act less than the amount which would be produced by a rate of threepence in the pound, the Parliamentary grants shall be decreased, and the amount payable shall be increased by a sum equal in each case to half the difference."

I worked very hard at that Clause for some time, and I invoked the aid of one or two skilled persons who were not altogether unconnected with the preparation of the Bill, but I am bound to say I should be very sorry to have to make the necessary calculations. In the first place it would be necessary to obtain the number of scholars in each county; then you would have to find out how much it would take to bring the amount up to 10s. each child; then you get into the three-halfpence and twopences calculation; in short, I can neither make head nor tail of it. I hope when we are in Committee the noble Duke will give us a lucid explanation, so that we may be able to understand the Clause. [" You cannot amend it."] No, but we can discuss it. We do not want to amend it, but it would be most satisfactory if anybody could give us something approaching a lucid explanation of it. We must remember that with regard to the cost of this Bill, no calculation whatsoever can be made from what has been spent up to the present time. As soon as this Bill passes the voluntary schools will no longer be under financial necessities; they will at once be levelled up to the standard of the board schools. I dare say that that may be a very good thing, but, at the same time, the increase of expense which your Lordships and the country must be prepared for is, I believe, very large indeed.

Then we come to another matter which was alluded to by Lord Goschen to-night, and that is the question of the two inspectors. I dare say it has sometimes happened to your Lordships when you had a point which you thought a rather good one that somebody else has made it before you. That is what Lord Goschen has done in regard to this matter to-night. I had intended to bring this point of the two inspectors before your Lordships, but he has done so fully and thoroughly. You are aware of the objections there are even to one inspector in the fact that all inspectors, even Board Inspectors, are not necessarily sensible men, but when you add to the Board Inspectors these new inspectors, who, apparently, under the Bill, may and probably will be sent by the local authority, the case is much worse. You will have not only two inspectors but two sets of requirements, and two sets of requirements occasionally mean, as Lord Goschen said, two sets of faddists, and certainly a very considerable increase of expenditure. My regret at the alteration which has been made in the financial system of the Act of 1870 is chiefly owing to the fact that it appears to me that it was so entirely unnecessary. There was nothing to hinder the local authority from setting up any standard of education that it saw fit, and there was nothing to prevent it sending inspectors to see that the standard was observed. After all, the education of the children of each parish is surely a matter of strictly local concern, and it is, I anticipate, the object of Parliament to arouse, excite, and stimulate local interest in the schools as much as possible. If you had left the existing system alone you would have had the subscriptions: in that way the owners would have contributed towards the cost of the Bill; you would have had the grants, and it would then have been to the interest of the managers and the schoolmasters for financial reasons to make the schools as successful as possible; and if there had been any money wanted after that we all know that persons will pay, whether they be owners or otherwise, if they know the money is to be spent for their own children and in their own immediate locality, whereas they will not give when they have no idea as to where the money is going or how it is to be spent. I apprehend that the reason of this alteration is that the weak schools may be supported. If it is desirable to support weak schools and to give them extra support, by all means let that be done, but why is it to be done by the ratepayers of a county? It seems to me that if financial aid of that kind is to be given it ought to be given by the national taxpayer. So far as I read the Bill, a very large contribution is to be given to the local authority in lieu of the aid grant. Why should not these payments be made out of the aid grant in the same manner as before?

I would now call your Lordships' attention to another matter, and that is the consideration of how this Bill is likely to work. My belief is, that when the supporters of denominational schools have succeeded in transferring the burden to the county ratepayers, they will have done the very worst day's work for themselves that ever they did. The effect of the Bill in its operation will be gradually to destroy, or at all events greatly to diminish, voluntary schools. In the first place, there are many voluntary schools which have no trust deed. Is it not obvious that their interest will be to make themselves county schools, because, if they come under the county they will no longer be under the necessity of keeping up their buildings? I do not say that this is at all a matter to be regretted. Personally, I do not think it is. Indeed, in my view the most important feature of the Bill is the creation of the county schools, and, in endeavouring to work the Bill according to its spirit—as I should certainly do—I should be inclined to use any influence I might possess in any school to get that school transferred to the county. But, my Lords, with regard to the Church schools, I think it will be found that when you rest the county rate upon all the occupiers in a parish, experience will tell your Lordships that it will be more than difficult to extract voluntary subscriptions for the purpose of keeping up the school buildings. Everybody will say "We have paid our rate. You tell us we ought to subscribe to keep up denominational schools. Our answer is that we prefer to let the schools go." In reply to those who use that argument, it may be said that if they do not subscribe they may have to build another school. I do not think there is much force in that remark. If the schools of the Church, which are under trust deeds, are empty, I do not believe that Parliament would allow new schools to be built while those other schools remained empty. Parliament would fairly and properly say that the primary purpose for which those schools were built was that of education, and that if private individuals on religious grounds cannot obtain the subscriptions necessary to keep them up it would then be necessary to employ the schools for the purposes of education.

Taking this view, I must confess that what surprises me is that the Nonconformists should oppose this Bill in the bitter manner they do. They seem to be exactly like the members of the United Kingdom Alliance, who, being devoted to temperance, for a great many years sturdily refused to accept anything but the complete abolition of licences. So far as I read this Bill, it is bound to work in the direction of increasing the number of board or provided schools, and I think that that tendency is likely to continue and extend.

I do not say that the Bill which the Government have introduced is the one I should have liked best to see. There is an alternative which, personally, I should have much preferred. It was alluded to the other night by the Prime Minister, and it has been alluded to by others. I refer to the proposal to abolish the Cowper-Temple Clause in the county schools, and at the same time to aid the voluntary schools from the rates. I confess that I cannot see the injustice of that course being taken. I see many advantages which a plan of that sort would have over the scheme proposed by the Government, and I certainly should have given my most hearty support to such a proposal. I do not see that there is any injustice to Nonconformists in doing away with the Cowper-Temple Clause. Under this Bill as it stands, if Nonconformists are so deeply imbued with the religious difficulty that they desire to erect schools of their own, they have the opportunity of going before the Board of Education and obtaining power to erect such a school if they can prove it to be a right school to erect. The great objection taken to this plan the other night by the Prime Minister was that it would be opposed tooth and nail by the Nonconformists. Have the Nonconformists not opposed this Bill? What tooth or what nail do the Nonconformists possess that they have not used in opposition to the present measure? How long has the struggle against this Bill gone on? What more could the Nonconformists have done against any other proposal than they have done against this? One of my reasons, even the chief reason, for supporting this Bill is the helpless and hopeless attitude which the Nonconformists have taken up throughout the whole of these discussions. I think I have read all the reports of meetings and of the proceedings in Parliament on the subject, and I have no doubt many of your Lordships will sympathise with me in the ordeal through which I have gone. My object has been to look for some practical proposition, some ray of light, some offer made by the Nonconformists to deal with the situation, the difficulties of which no one attempts to deny, but I have found nothing. The noble Earl, who moved the rejection of the Bill spoke of a universal School Board, or a School Board in every parish. ["No"]. Then I am incorrect, and the noble Earl made no suggestion to-night for meeting the difficult situation which has been created. We are in the presence of a situation from which some escape must be found; you must make up your minds either to see these schools starve and disappear, or to give them assistance by rate aid. It is because I see no way out of the difficulty except that of rate aid that I shall support the Second Reading of the Bill.

*LORD HARRIS: I shall not detain your Lordships more than a few minutes; I simply wish to ask a question. I am not sure whether I should address my question to the First Lord of the Admiralty or to His Majesty's First Commissioner of Works, but there does not appear to be anybody on the Front Bench representing the Board of Education. The question I have to ask is whether the Board of Education, under Clause 17, have the power to compel the education authority under Clause 2 of Part II. to levy a rate. According to Clause 2—

> "The local education authority should consider the educational needs of their area and take such steps as seem to them desirable."

and under Clause 17—

> "If the local education authority fail to fulfil any of their duties under the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, or this Act . . . the Board of Education may, after holding a public inquiry, make such order as they think necessary or proper for the purpose of compelling the authority to fulfil their duty . . ."

The question is—What is their duty? Is the mere preparation of a scheme their duty, or is it for the Board of Education to declare what is their duty? My object in asking the question is that we may be perfectly sure of what the intentions of the Government are as to the provision of secondary education institutions within the areas. In the county to which I belong we have never used any part of the whisky money in relief of the rates, but have used the whole of it for technical education, and technical education, I imagine, is secondary education. Therefore, unless our scheme of technical education is to be interrupted it would be necessary, if the Board of Education had the power to compel us, to levy a rate. I want to know what the Government conception of the drafting of this Bill is—whether it is their intention that the Board of Education should be able to compel a county to levy a rate for establishing secondary education institutions. I will not attempt to conceal what I feel upon this particular point. I think that in doubling the liability of the ratepayers for secondary education, those members of the Government who belong to the Conservative Party are departing from the promises which they have made to the ratepayers for many years past.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: There is no fear of the county being compelled to levy a rate; there is no question of it. I will deal with the question fully tomorrow.

*LORD HARRIS: I do not quite follow my noble friend. Clause 2 of the Bill distinctly provides that the county may levy a rate, and if it is true that the Board of Education may compel the county to do so, I think my question is quite legitimate. But to proceed from the point at which I was interrupted. I think that in doubling the liability of the ratepayers in regard to the provision of secondary education the Government is departing from those promises which through many years it has made to the ratepayers. I do not deny for a moment the gratitude which the ratepayers ought to feel to the Government for the many things it has done for them in the way of relief, but as regards this particular subject of secondary education it must be remembered that the Royal Commission on Local Taxation has most distinctly laid down that secondary education is a national liability. In the face of that declaration a Conservative Government is doubling the liability of the ratepayers in that direction. If in addition to that the Government provide that the Board of Education may compel the county to levy a rate, I think it will have undertaken a very dangerous task. With every other part of the Bill I am in entire accord, but having regard to everything I have said on the public platform with regard to the ratepayers it is impossible for me to approve of this particular proposal.

Further debate adjourned until To-morrow.

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, till to-morrow Half-Past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 4th December, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: From Wem; Swansea; and Dunfermline; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCANTILE CRUISERS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Mercantile Cruisers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (WATER-TUBE BOILERS).

Copy presented, of Report on Trials of H.M.S. "Sheldrake," H.M.S. "Seagull," H.M.S. "Espiègle," and H.M.S. "Fantôme" (with diagrams) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st December, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Scientific Adviser in the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Ireland, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are requisite [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) RULES (JERSEY).

Copy presented, of Rules made under The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, as extended by the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation (Jersey) Act, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT).

Copy presented, of Report of the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SPIRITS (ABERDEEN, ELGIN, AND INVERNESS).

Return ordered, "for the collection of Aberdeen, Elgin, and Inverness, relating to spirits, giving (1) the stock of spirits in bond at the 31st day of March, 1901; (2) total spirits bonded from the 31st day of March, 1901, to the 31st day of March, 1902; (3) total spirits cleared from bond from the 31st day of March, 1901, to the 31st day of March, 1902."—(*Mr. Gordon.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Rabies in Dogs brought from Abroad.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will say what were the dates of the two cases of rabies in dogs imported from the Continent since the order of 1897; from what countries the dogs were imported, and how long after their landing in this country the disease was detected, and, in the case of the dog brought back by its owner with a licence from the Board, how long the dog had been abroad; under what circumstances and in what place, the owner's house or a veterinary establishment, the disease was detected; and whether the owner attempted to conceal the disease or gave aid to the authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) The two cases of rabies to which the hon. Member refers occurred in December, 1898, and April, 1899, in dogs brought respectively from France and Gibraltar. In the one case nearly three months elapsed between the landing of the dog and the detection of the disease, and in the other there was an interval of a fortnight. The dog which has been taken abroad had remained abroad for fifteen months. In both cases the dog was detained on private premises, and in neither was there any attempt at the concealment of the disease, its existence being reported in the one case by the owner and in the other by the veterinary surgeon who had been called in.

Island of Lewis—Water Supply.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the water available at Valtos, Uig, Ness, Coulregrein, Bragar, and the east end of Leurbost, Island of Lewis, is of an unsatisfactory character, will he say when wells with force-pumps will be supplied.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that a well with a force pump was constructed two months ago at Valtos, Uig; that samples of water taken from Ness were not considered quite satisfactory, and accordingly the District Committee are endeavouring to secure a good spring in a central spot before constructing a well; that tenders have been invited for a well at Coulregrein; and that both at Bragar and the east end of Leurbost a well is in course of construction, while another well with a force pump was constructed at the west end of Leurbost about three months ago.

Ross-shire Roads.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Western District Committee for Ross and Cromarty recently received a memorial from a public meeting at Applecross, Ross-shire, pointing out that, although the people of the townships of Camusheel, Ardhu, Ardbain and Coillieghillie are rated for the upkeep and maintenance of highways, no footpath of any kind exists for the connection of those townships with one another or with the main road; and, seeing that the people have offered free labour with a view to secure the construction of the required paths, will he say whether the Congested Districts Board are prepared to provide a grant in aid of the work.

(*Answered by Mr. A Graham Murray.*) I am informed by the Congested Districts Board that on 13th November they received an application from the Western District Committee of Ross for grants in aid of the construction of these paths, and that they are making the inquiries necessary to enable them to come to a decision.

House of Commons—Alterations in News Room.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the hon. Member for North Hunts if the First Commissioner of Works will, before the commencement of next session, consider whether the news room can be made available for the convenient accommodation of a larger number of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The First Commissioner of Works has given instructions for fitting glazed screens to the windows of this room as in the smoking room for the prevention of draughts. An additional rack for papers will be provided, also two more armchairs. The large round table will be removed.

Provision for Aged Auxiliary Postmen.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): To ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the case of rural and other postmen who have spent the greater portion of their lives in post office work and are compelled to resign owing to old age; and whether, seeing that in some instances the condition of service of these men disqualifies them for any award under the Superannuation Acts, and that in some cases auxiliary postmen are thus left destitute, he will consider the question of introducing legislation with the object of providing some pension or gratuity for them.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) No, Sir. The position of the postal servants referred to in the Question does not differ from that of many employees of other Departments of the State, and it is evident that the Postmaster General cannot initiate separate legislation on the subject.

Australian Mail Service.

Mr. JOSEPH HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Postmaster General whether he can explain why the

New Zealand and Australian mails are kept back at New York and sent by a New York line of steamers; and also whether he will make representations to the United States postal authorities of the inconvenience caused by this means to British traders, and point out the importance of sending on the mails by the first available steamer.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have no knowledge of any such detention as is described in the Question. On the contrary, the mails in question are understood to be sent on from New York by the steamer which will secure their earliest arrival in this country. During the present year the Australasian mails have been brought to this country from New York more frequently by the British steamers of the Cunard Line than by those of any other company, but they do not always reach New York in time for the Saturday despatch. There does not appear to be any case to represent to the United States Post Office.

Pacific Cable.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he will consider the advisability of arranging with the Pacific Cable Board that, in the interval before opening the Pacific cable to public traffic, or at any other early and convenient date, the consulting engineers to the Board should conduct a series of speed trials over the Vancouver to Fanning Island cable to ascertain, in the interest of scientific knowledge, how many letters per minute this cable is capable of carrying under the simplex and duplex conditions of working, and under either or both of these conditions, when an automatic curb is employed, and whether a report of such trials, together with the final tests after the laying of this cable, can be made public.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) I am glad to be able to say that the cable has been laid in perfect condition and that the tests for insulation and conductivity are satisfactory. The consulting engineers of the Pacific Cable Board have conducted a series of speed trials over the Vancouver to Fanning section of the cable. These tests show that the cable is capable of carrying eighty-five letters a minute with hand working, one hundred letters a minute with automatic curb working, and, approximately, one hundred and sixty-eight letters a minute (eighty-four letters each way) with duplex and curbed automatic working. These tests exceed the anticipations of the expert witnesses who gave evidence before the Pacific Cable Committees.

South Africa—Trade Mark Fees

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, S.): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that a manufacturer wishing to register a trade mark throughout British South Africa would have to pay separate fees for each of the five Colonies, amounting altogether to £70 or thereabouts, and whether he will consider the advisability of consulting with the Governments of those Colonies with a view to their arriving at some joint arrangement in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) The question is one affecting the internal revenue of the several Colonies, with which His Majesty's Government are unable to interfere.

Canadian and Australian Bounties on Beet Sugar.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, does the province of Ontario, in the Dominion of Canada, grant any, and, if so, what bounties on the production or export of sugar, or of sugar products, or other analogous products containing in a notable proportion sugar artificially incorporated, and, if so, what is the rate of such bounty; does Queensland grant any such bounties, and, if so, what is the rate thereof; and do any of the other countries included in the self-governing Colonies of the British Empire grant such bounties.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Ontario grants a temporary and limited bounty for three years only on the production of beet sugar, the term of three years expiring at the end of 1903; Queensland does not grant any such bounties. The grant of bounties in Australia is now subject to the control of the Federal Legislature. No such bounties are granted in any other of the self-governing Colonies.

Colonial Bounties on Agricultural Products.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): To ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he will give a Return showing the bounties paid by the self-governing or Crown Colonies, directly or indirectly, on the production or export of agricultural products, and stating the amount of such bounty paid on each separate article in each Colony.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, for the Secretary of State for the Colonies.*) Yes, Sir.

North-Eastern Railway—Haxey Level Crossing.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that a level crossing of the projected Isle of Axholme Railway to be constructed by the North-Eastern Railway in that district traverses the main street of the village of Haxey; and whether, in view of the opposition of the Haxey Parish Council to the crossing, he can take any steps to have the railway diverted from the centre of the village.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The railway was authorised by an Order under the Light Railways Act in 1899, and the Order contains no provision enabling the Board of Trade to divert the railway. No opposition to the Order appears to have proceeded from the Haxey Parish Council.

Salmon Fisheries' Commission Report.

MR. RICHARD CAVENDISH (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he intends to introduce a Bill next session to carry out the recommendations contained in the Report of the Salmon Fisheries' Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am afraid I am not in a position to give any undertaking on this subject.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade can he give the reference to any passage either in the Brussels Sugar Convention itself or in any of the *procès-verbaux*, or in any other document, showing that where any doubts exist as to the interpretation of a Clause in the Convention, reference is to be made to the *procès-verbal*.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) Where a Treaty is the result of a Conference the instrument is always interpreted in the light of the *procès-verbaux*. But I must not be understood to suggest that any doubt arises on the text of the Sugar Convention itself, that we are in any circumstances under any obligation to penalise sugar from a British self-governing Colony.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade is he aware that on the 17th December, 1901, the delegate of His Majesty's Government to the Sugar Conference at Brussels declared that even if bounties on sugar were abolished the Cartels with the surtax would re-establish their inconveniences; and will he state what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take in order to procure the abolition either of the Cartels or of the surtax.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The declaration referred to related to the operation of Cartels in the absence of any limitation of surtax. Article III. of the Convention provides for the limitation of the surtax to an amount which the Conference considered would not permit of the re-establishment of the inconveniences resulting from bounties.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the statement by the Danish Minister of Finance that, in his opinion, England would be obliged, by the terms of the Sugar Convention, to levy countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar for her self-governing Colonies and India; and what steps he proposes to take, before ratifying the Treaty, to secure that no such obligation will rest on the British Government.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The hon. Member probably refers to the proceedings in the Dutch Second Chamber. As already stated, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government no such obligation rests upon His Majesty's Government.

Navy—Practice Ammunition—Gunnery Regulations.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether the Admiralty propose to make any alteration in the gunnery regulations in the direction of authorising an increased allowance of practice ammunition, improving the conditions of prize firing, and making long range firing more efficient.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The question of the desirability of altering the gunnery regulations in these respects amongst others is under consideration, but I am not as yet in a position to say what alterations, if any, it will be decided to make in the existing regulations.

Naval Prize Money Return.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the cause of delay in printing and circulating the list of persons entitled to naval prize money covering the period from 1856 to 1897, and when its issue may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The Paper in question is a voluminous one, extending to about 200 pages, and the printing has necessarily occupied a longer time than would be required for the issue of a less bulky Parliamentary Paper. There has, however, been no unnecessary delay, and I am informed that the printers hope to have the Paper ready for issue within a week.

Bluejackets' Clothing.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state why the price of clothing to the lower deck ratings was recently raised; and whether he will take steps to fix a uniform price for the articles of clothing used by the Bluejackets.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) A full explanation of these variations in price will be found in the reply I gave to the honourable Member on the 15th April last.† As I pointed out then, any rise or fall in the prices charged to the men is solely the result of a rise or fall in the prices paid by the Admiralty. It is not considered advisable to fix a uniform price for these articles, as such a course would sometimes involve a loss to the Crown and at other times a loss to the men

Naval Gunnery — H.M.S. "Empress of India."

MR. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that during the recent prize firing practice of H.M.S. "Empress of India," the flagship of Rear-Admiral Jeffreys, only three shots out of 18 fired from the 13·5-inch guns, and 17 hits out of 69 shots fired from the 6 inch guns were made, he will state what steps the Lords of the Admiralty propose to adopt to prevent the recurrence of such a low average of shooting in this ship.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The prize firing of the "Empress of India" on this occasion cannot, as brought to the notice of the Admiralty by Admiral Jeffreys, be regarded as satisfactory. It is partially, however, accounted for by the fact that this ship has just returned from a three months refit in the dockyard, during which time the target practice could not be carried out, and many of her men were temporarily employed in other ships. The "Empress of India" now flies the flag of the Rear-Admiral of the Home Squadron and is carrying out the prescribed exercises, which will no doubt remedy the shortcomings referred to.

Local Government Audit—Subscriptions of Metropolitan Boroughs to the Association of Municipal Corporations.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that a subscription to the Association of Municipal Corporations by a metropolitan borough was disallowed by the auditor, and that this disallowance was upheld on appeal by the Local Government Board; and whether he will take steps to make it known to the Corporations of all boroughs, whether metropolitan or under the Municipal Corporations Act of 1882, that such subscriptions are not properly chargeable to the rates.

---

† See (4) *Debates* cvi., 276.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) A disallowance was made in the accounts of one of the metropolitan Borough Councils of expenditure of the kind referred to on the ground that there was no statutory authority for the payment. On an appeal being made to me the legality of the auditor's decision was upheld, but the disallowance was remitted. As regards the last part of the Question, I think it probable that the Councils of metropolitan boroughs are aware of the decision in the case mentioned; but at all events the Question of my hon. friend will no doubt have the effect of making it known to them. I have no jurisdiction with regard to the matter so far as the Councils of other boroughs are concerned.

Army and Navy Reservists in Canterbury Workhouse.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the fact that last week twenty-one Reservists just returned from South Africa were admitted to the Canterbury Workhouse, and that they were compelled to break stones before their departure each day; and whether he will provide that, in the case of men who have served in South Africa and bear high characters, the breaking of stones will be omitted from their task before leaving the workhouses.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have made inquiry on this subject, and I understand that, of the twenty-one Reservists referred to, only five had just returned from South Africa, the rest being Army and Naval Reservists and time-expired men. I am informed that none of these men asked to be excused their task of stone-breaking or stone-pounding, which is the task usually given to able-bodied males admitted to the casual wards of the Canterbury Workhouse. The Guardians are, however, now considering the advisability of admitting any *bonâ fide* cases into the workhouse until full inquiries can be made, with a view to employment being obtained through the East Kent Association for the employment of reserve and discharged soldiers.

Education Bill—Liabilities of Transferred Authorities.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if the debts and liabilities of School Boards, other than those incurred on capital account, which are transferred to a County Council on the appointed day will be charged on the old School Board area or on the whole education area of the County Council.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The debts and liabilities in question will be charged on the old School Board area. The whole subject is dealt with by Section 86 of the Local Government Act, 1894, which is applied by paragraph 8 of the Second Schedule of the Bill. Under this section current liabilities are to be liquidated so far as possible before the appointed day. In case any liabilities are not so liquidated and are carried over to the new authority, machinery is provided by the same section for enabling them to be met in the same manner as before the transfer.

China—Position in the Yang-tsze Valley.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will explain how the International situation created by the circumstances set forth in the China (No. 3, 1902) Paper affects the position of this country in the Yang-tsze Valley.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The views of His Majesty's Government are set forth in the Papers contained in the Parliamentary Paper, and it does not seem possible to add anything in explanation of them by way of answer to a Question.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the Dutch Minister of Finance stated on the 2nd December, in the Dutch Second Chamber, that Great Britain will be bound by the terms of the Brussels Sugar Convention to levy countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar from her autonomous Colonies and from British India; can he state whether any, and, if so, which of the other States who have signed the Convention adopt a construction of its terms similar to that of the Dutch Minister of Finance; are there any other, and, if so, what points or articles in the Convention as to which any of the other contracting States adopt a different construction from that of His Majesty's Government, and which are those States.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. In answer to the second Question I have to say that it is the fact that the interpretation which I gave to the House yesterday has been called in question from other quarters. His Majesty's Government, however, are satisfied that this interpretation is correct, but until the correspondence which has arisen upon the point has been concluded it would be premature to give the information asked for. In reply to the last Question I am not aware of any points or articles upon which a construction is placed different from that adopted by ourselves.

Ireland—Conduct of Police at Glenville.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of a sergeant and two police constables at Glenville, on Sunday, the 23rd of November, in demanding admission to an ordinary indoor meeting of the local branch of the United Irish League, and, on being refused, attempting to force an entrance, which, failing to effect, they then proceeded to fasten the door of the League room, thus preventing ingress and egress; and will the police be instructed to refrain from interference with the ordinary meetings of the United Irish League at Glenville.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The police did not seek admission to this meeting, nor did they fasten the door.

Irish Technical Instruction—Equivalent Grant.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what decision has been arrived at by the Treasury in the matter of the equivalent grant for technical instruction in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It has been decided that the existing grants, amounting to £3,500, shall continue, but that a limit to their expansion should be laid down, not as a final limit, but as a future point of departure for the reconsideration of these grants in correlation with other Irish demands, whether educational or industrial, which may be disclosed, and with the resources available to meet them. The limit is fixed, provisionally in accordance with these considerations, at £7,000 a year.

Irish School Building Grants.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the grant of two-thirds of the cost of building new national schools in Ireland is made on an estimate of the cost of labour and materials of some thirty years ago, which estimate now barely equals one-half of the cost; and whether, in view of these circumstances, he will consider the advisability of increasing the grant to two-thirds of the actual cost, the increase to date from the commencement of 1903, so as to enable the building of new schools to be commenced immediately.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The question of a revision of the scale on which grants are made towards the erection of national school buildings has recently been inquired into by a Departmental Committee, which is now considering its report.

China Operations, 1900—Medals and Clasps.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the Table General Dorward's despatch of November, 1901, with reference to the Chinese regiment; and will he say whether a clasp will be given for Tientsin.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The question of a clasp for Tientsin was considered by the War Office and India Office and Admiralty in consultation at the time of the grant of the China 1900 medal, and it was decided that only two clasps should be given, one for Taku and one for the relief of Peking. I have no copy of General Dorward's despatch in my possession, but I understand that it is not considered desirable to publish it.

Irish Gold Ornaments Dispute.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when the trial of the case of the Irish Gold Ornaments is likely to take place.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that it is expected that this case will be tried at the next sittings, commencing in January.

Municipal Corporation Act Amendment.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that by Section 1 of the Education (England and Wales) Bill, the Council of a borough with a population of over ten thousand becomes the local education authority for the purpose of Part III. of the Act, and that the clergy and minister have in the past taken a leading part in educational affairs as members of School Boards and otherwise, he intends to introduce a Bill to repeal Section 12 of The Municipal Corporation Act, 1882, which disqualifies any person who is in holy orders or the regular minister of a dissenting congregation for being members of a municipal corporation, and to allow the clergy and ministers to be members both of County Councils and of Borough Councils.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Government do not propose to introduce such a Bill.

Solway Fishery Regulations.

MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to alter the state of the Fishery Laws on both sides of the Solway, seeing that such remedial legislation has been recommended by the three last Royal Commissions on the Salmon Fisheries.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour*). Something has been done to assimilate the bye-laws of the Fishery Board for Scotland with those made by the Cumberland Local Fisheries Committee relating to sea fisheries; but to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners (involving the constitution of a separate Solway authority) would require legislation, and that legislation, whether controversial or not, could evidently not be introduced at present.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Permit Regulations.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he will state on what ground the practice of granting permits in this country to persons desirous of proceeding to the Transvaal or Orange River Colony has been discontinued; and will he state or publish the conditions under which permits are now granted, on application to the permit office, at the port of debarkation in South Africa.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E., for Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): The practice has been discontinued because of the practical difficulties of giving effect in this country to the provisions of the local laws on the subject. A notice on the subject of the issue of these permits has been published by the Transvaal and Orange River Colony Governments and will be communicated to the Press in this country.

Soldiers' Pay in South Africa.

MR LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the total amount per diem, including allowances, paid to non-commissioned officers and men now serving in South Africa.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The non-commissioned officers and men of the regular army serving in South Africa receive the same pay and money allowances as elsewhere. They get in South Africa the benefit of a free grocery ration, and certain other issues in kind are made to them which, if at home, would have to be met out of the money allowance for messing.

South African Blockhouses.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state approximately the cost of the blockhouses which were erected in South Africa during the war; to whom have the blockhouses been sold, and at what price; were tenders invited; and, if so, how many tenders were received.

MR. BRODRICK: The blockhouses in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies were taken over by Lord Milner at a valuation agreed upon by him with Lord Kitchener: the question of sale by open tender did not therefore arise. The accounts have not yet been forwarded to us. It is impossible, without a reference to South Africa, which I am not prepared to make, to ascertain the cost of erection.

Army Reserve.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the present position of the Army Reserve, and the effect on the numbers of the reserve of the new proposals for the re-engagement of time-expired men.

MR. BRODRICK: The strength of the First-Class Army Reserve on the 1st November was estimated at 46,000. The precise number will be ascertainable when the men on gratuity furlough are re-transferred to the reserve. The number of men who have rejoined the colours is approximately 600.

Provisional Regiment of Dragoons—Ex-Sergeant Leonard.

*MR. GEORGE FABER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, in regard to ex-Sergeant Leonard's case, he can now state what measures he has determined to take consequent upon the inquiry by the General Officer commanding the York district into the state of the Provisional Regiment of Dragoons now stationed in York; what was the result of the inquiry into the allegations made by Leonard in his letter to the Secretary of State for War on the 8th October last, and will he say why Leonard was not called as a witness at the inquiry.

MR. BRODRICK: The matter is at present under the consideration of the Commander-in-Chief, and I have therefore nothing to add to the statement I made on the 26th ultimo.† I must point out to my hon. friend that the report of the inquiry made by the General Officer commanding to the Commander-in-Chief is strictly confidential.

*MR. GEORGE FABER: Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the last paragraph of the Question?

MR. BRODRICK: No. It was a military inquiry, and I presume that the ordinary course was pursued.

Naval Cadets—Cost of Messing.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the cost per head of the messing of cadets in His Majesty's Navy, as well as the number and character of the meals provided.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The average cost of messing of the Naval Cadets in H.M.S. "Britannia" is 2s. 3d. a head per diem. Three meals are provided in the day, viz., breakfast, dinner, and tea. A statement of the dietary will be found on page 21 of the published regulations for H.M.S. "Britannia."

Mediterranean Squadron—Ranking of Inspectors of Machinery.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet has laid it down that for official entertainments inspectors of machinery shall rank with commanders in command; whether, seeing that by Admiralty instructions inspectors of machinery have the relative rank of captain, this order of the Admiral embraces the Deputy Inspector of Hospitals at Malta, who also hold the relative rank of captain; will he say whether this order was sanctioned by the Board of Admiralty; and, if so, for what purpose.

---

† See page 501.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I must ask leave to refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave to the hon. Member for North Salford as recently as Monday last, and which was as follows: "No information has reached the Admiralty to the effect stated in the hon. Member's Question, but inquiry will be made, and I shall be happy to answer a further Question on the subject when the reply has been received." Steps have been taken already to fulfil the promise then given, but I think the hon. Member will agree that it is not unreasonable to allow more than three days for an inquiry which involves communication with the Mediterranean.

Naval Engineer Artificers.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in some of His Majesty's ships where engineer artificers are appointed in lieu of assistant engineers, the captains refuse to give to the artificers the cabin accommodation assigned to assistant engineers; and will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty are not aware that the facts are as stated in the Question, but if the hon. Member will send me the information on which his inquiry is based the matter will be looked into.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Will the hon. Gentleman ask if it is not the fact that the Captain of one of His Majesty's ships refused to grant a cabin to an engineer artificer who was doing duty as assistant engineer?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It will be more satisfactory if the hon. Member will send me the information.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: I will do so.

Naval Construction—"County" Class of Cruisers.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the reasons which have induced the Lords of the Admiralty to alter the designs of the cruisers of the "County" class; and what alterations have been, or are to be, made in these ships.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No alterations have been made in the design of the first ten ships of the "County" class, except that in three cases Belleville boilers have given place to other types of water-tube boilers. In the case of the last six ships of the class—(1) the thickness of the armour was increased from 4 inches to 6 inches to enable them to better withstand modern projectiles. This modification involved an increase in displacement of about 500 tons. (2) The number and type of guns forming the auxiliary armament was altered, and 7·5 inch guns were substituted for the twin 6-inch guns fore and aft. (3) Certain internal modifications have also been made to enable the ships to carry a combination of cylindrical and water-tube boilers. No other changes in the design are contemplated.

H.M.S. "Canopus."

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state if it is the intention of the Lords of the Admiralty to shortly recall H.M.S. "Canopus" from the Mediterranean squadron; and, if so, for what reasons they are taking this step; whether the boilers, condensers, and economisers of this ship require repairing or replacement; whether he will state why, during the recent manœuvres of the Mediterranea squadron, this ship was compelled to withdraw; how many times this vessel has been in the dockyard under repair during her commission, and the longest period she remained in the dockyard on any occasion; whether it is usual to bring back battleships at the end of their first three years in the Mediterranean; and if he can state what this vessel has cost in repairs to boilers and otherwise during the period of her commission.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is intended to recall the "Canopus" from the Mediterrean, as she requires an extensive refit. Battleships requiring small refits are sent to Malta, but it is now the practice to bring back all battleships which require large refits at the end of three years, and to repair them in the home dockyards. The boilers and economisers of the "Canopus" are of the earliest type of their class, which have been found to be less satisfactory than the later designs. The ship was ordered not to take part in chasing in the Mediterranean manœuvres, on account, it is believed, of defects in her economisers. The "Canopus" has been under repair on eleven occasions since she was commissioned. The longest period for which she has been in dockyard hands is four months eight days. The cost of repairs to her boilers since first commissioning has been about £3,100, and the total cost of repairs £15,800.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Is it not the fact that this battleship's economisers and boilers are practically done, and that the vessel cannot steam?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have no such information. When I have the report as to what the defects are I shall be ready to give the House the information. I shall ascertain exactly what is wrong.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (Woolwich): Will the hon. Gentleman recommend that these boilers shall be at once placed on the scrap-heap, so that the country's money shall not be expended on useless repairs?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question of effective repairs must be decided by the Controller of the Navy; but the Question of the noble Lord will be brought under his notice.

Naval Gunnery—China Squadron—Admiral Seymour's Order.

MR. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty has countermanded Admiral Sir E. H. Seymour's order when Commander-in-Chief in China to the effect that the ship holding the Seymour Challenge Cup for good shooting will always take the right of the line at all parades on shore or whenever a brigade is landed.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty has given no orders with respect to this Question, which is one entirely within the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief on the Station.

Russia and Gibraltar.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have any information to the effect that Russia has obtained the Chafarinas or Zafarinas Islands on the coast of Morocco, near to Gibraltar, as a coaling or naval station; and is he aware that the Spanish Government is preparing to fortify certain points on Spanish territory adjacent to Gibraltar, and that the Captain General of Algeciras has given notice to owners of land in the neighbourhood of that place, whether Spaniards or others, not to proceed with any buildings within the military radius.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): No such information has been received.

Export of Japanese Beverages from Kobe.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the fact that beer to the value of £46,536 was exported from Kobe, Japan, during the year 1900–1901, and that beverages to the value of £21,360 were exported from that port during the same period, can he ascertain of what these beverages consisted.

*LORD CRANBORNE: The point referred to in the Question will be brought to the notice of His Majesty's Minister at Tokio, and he will be requested to furnish the information, provided it can be readily obtained.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether, in view of the fact that the Brussels Sugar Convention is incorrectly translated from the binding French text into English as regards Article X., he will arrange that the careful revision of the whole translation for the version to be inserted in the Treaty Series shall be made forthwith, and the revised translation laid upon the Table and circulated among Members of this House.

*LORD CRANBORNE: Publication in the Treaty Series cannot take place until after the Treaty has been ratified. As soon as the translation for the Treaty Series is made it shall be laid before Parliament.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Was it not stated the other day that there was a difference of opinion amongst the contracting parties as to the effect of the provisions of the Convention?

*LORD CRANBORNE: That is not the question that deals with the English translation of the French version in which my hon. friend has found a mistake.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is it not the fact that there are other mistakes, and will the noble Lord, for the benefit of hon. Members who only understand the English language see that the House is put in possession of a correct version forthwith?

*LORD CRANBORNE: Yes, I will do my best to hurry it forward.

Russia and the Sugar Convention.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has received from the Russian Government a communication intimating that the imposition by Great Britain of countervailing duties on Russian sugar would be regarded as an infringement of the commercial treaty between the two Powers, and suggesting that the question should be referred to the Permanent Arbitration Court at the Hague; and, if so, will he say what reply has been made by His Majesty's Government to the Russian Government.

*LORD CRANBORNE: The answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. With regard to arbitration, the Russian Government have stated that, if His Majesty's Government expressed the wish to submit the question of the bearing of countervailing duties on sugar upon the treaty to international arbitration, they themselves would find no difficulty in falling in with this desire, and would consider that the question should be discussed not only with regard to sugar, but generally with regard to all other descriptions of goods. The Russian Government have been informed that His Majesty's Government cannot agree that the case, even if restricted to the matter immediately at issue, is one proper to be submitted to an arbitral tribunal, but that they are willing to renew the offer made in 1899 to denounce the Treaty of Commerce of 1859.

Licensing Act, 1892—Translation into Welsh.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the desire in Wales for the translation of the Licensing Act, 1892, into Welsh, he will reconsider his decision upon this point, and will authorise the issue of a certain number of copies of the Act in the Welsh language.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): No, Sir! I hardly think that there is sufficient reason for taking this exceptional course. On the one hand a considerable portion of the Licensing Act is technical, and scarcely of popular interest, while on the other as regards those sections of it which have a distinct bearing on the general public they can be translated into Welsh and posted up, if thought desirable, by the police or other local authorities. If they do not do so, I will consider whether any action on my part can be taken.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for the latter part of his reply. Is he aware that the precedent exists in the cases of the Local Government Acts of 1888 and 1894?

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, I believe it is the fact that the Local Government Acts of 1888 and 1894 were translated, but it is not always done—for instance, the Welsh Sunday Closing Act of 1881 was not translated.

Income Tax Returns.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that certain public companies have been pressed by the local surveyors, by special official from Somerset House, and also by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, to disclose the amounts paid to their employees; where this information has been refused the returns of the employees have been surcharged and certificates demanded from the companies as to the amounts paid to the employees; and whether, seeing that people in business on their own account are their own assessors, he will give instructions to discontinue the portion of the Return relating to amount of incomes.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): My attention has not been called to any case of the kind described. But, if the hon. and gallant Member will supply particulars of any cases that have been brought to his notice, I will cause inquiry to be made. To discontinue the portion of the Return relating to amount of income would cause, I believe, much inconvenience, not only to the Department, but also to the public.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I will supply the right hon. Gentleman with the particulars of several cases. Meanwhile, will he not suppress that portion of the Return which has no statutory authority?

*MR. RITCHIE: I have said that that would cause great inconvenience, but if the cases of which the hon. Member promises particulars show hardship and just cause of complaint, I will reconsider that portion of the Return; but until I receive the particulars I can give no promise.

Intercommunication Apparatus on Railways.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state whether the apparatus for the intercommunication approved by the combined railway companies has been adopted by all the railway companies in the United Kingdom; and, if not, will he state what companies have refused to adopt the system.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The correspondence with the railway companies on this subject is contained in a Parliamentary Paper issued in 1899, and shows that at that time practically all the important companies had decided to adopt the system of communication by means of a partial application of the continuous brake. The principal exceptions were the companies already possessing electrical systems of communication and the Great Eastern Railway Company, who were in doubt as to the best method, but have since decided to adopt the brake system.

Mallaig Railway.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state when the Annual Report as to the condition and working of the West Highland Railway to Mallaig will be presented to Parliament.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Report in question has been prepared. Is is now in the hands of the printers, and will be presented as soon as possible.

Mail Car Contracts.

MR. WOOD (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that mail car contractors have, as a result of late running of mail trains, to wait for the mails from a half-hour to two and a half hours; is he aware that this causes inconvenience and loss to these men, for which no remuneration is allowed; and can he take any steps to redress this alleged grievance.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Whenever mail trains are unpunctual it necessarily follows that mail cars working in connection with them cannot be despatched at the appointed time. In the existing forms of tender for mail car contracts it is announced that the Post Office will not make any extra payment for detentions of mail cars due to this cause, and persons tendering are warned to bear this fact in mind. But the hon. Member no doubt has some service or services specially in view; and if he will be good enough to let me have particulars, I will see whether there is any cause for further inquiry.

Parcels Post for Agricultural Products.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will consider the advisability of instituting a cheap parcels post for perishable agricultural products.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of instituting a special parcel post for agricultural products has been considered on more than one occasion; but the difficulties surrounding it are so great that it has not hitherto been found possible to adopt any such scheme. This is, however, one of the questions which I propose to examine afresh as soon as I have leisure to do so.

Penalties for Illegal Trawling.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the maximum penalty imposed on the masters of trawlers for trawling within the three mile limit is fixed at £100, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of taking steps to so increase the penalty as to make i deterrent.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland cannot at present come under any promise to propose legislation on the subject.

Irish Land—Second Term Rents.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state the number of second term rents fixed in the several Provinces of Ireland between the 31st March and the 31st October last, and the average reductions on the amount of the rent fixed for the first time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The number fixed by the Land Commission in Ulster, Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, respectively, was 1,913, 557, 609, and 620; the percentages of reductions were 23·1, 15·8, 20·8, and 17. In Civil Bill Courts, the number fixed by Provinces, in the same order, was 51, 17, 90, and 269; the percentages of reduction were 20·1, 17·4, 17·6, and 19·1.

Boycotting Statistics.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the number of families and of persons wholly or partially boycotted in the several provinces of Ireland; and how many of such cases are due to agrarian questions.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The figures for the 30th November will not be available for a few days. But on the 31st October there were 42 cases, comprising 243 persons who were totally or partially boycotted throughout Ireland. The distribution, by provinces, was as follows:—Ulster, 2 cases, 4 persons; Leinster, nil; Connaught, 21 cases, 120 persons; Munster, 19 cases, 119 persons. Of these, 40 cases, affecting 229 persons, are due to causes of an agrarian nature. The latter figures include one case (11 persons) of total boycotting in Connaught, and three cases (16 persons) of total boycotting in Munster. In addition, there were, at the end of October, 150 cases of minor boycotting or attempts to boycott, affecting 673 persons. The gross totals on that date were, therefore, 192 cases and 916 persons. On the occasion of a debate in this House, on the 17th April last, I stated that there were, at that date, 318 cases of boycotting, involving some 1,500 persons.

Ogilby Estate, Co. Tyrone.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Ogilby Estate, county Tyrone, has been in the Landed Estates Court since the year 1882, he can state whether any progress as to the sale to the tenants has been made.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I called for a report on this question on Tuesday, but so far have not received it. In February last I was informed that the delay in the settlement of the rental on the estate was due solely to the action of two or three tenants who had resisted the claims of the remaining tenants to certain rights of turbary. I was also informed that a notice was about to be served on the former requiring them to state their objections, which would be adjudicated upon by the Land Judge and the settlement of the rental proceeded with.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Has the court any power to compel a refractory minority on a large estate to accept terms of agreement?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think so.

Ardglass Labourers' Cottages.

MR. WOOD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to applications made to the Downpatrick Rural District Council for labourers' cottages in the district of Ardglass; and will he explain the cause of delay in the erection of these cottages.

MR. WYNDHAM: In April the Local Government Board made a Provisional Order authorising the erection of seventeen cottages in the Downpatrick rural district, including three in the Division of Ardglass. The Order became absolute in July. Negotiations between the Council and the owners and occupiers in respect to the compensation payable to the latter for their interests in the lands to be acquired have broken down in many cases, and an application is about to be made to the Board to appoint an arbitrator.

Labourers' (Ireland) Acts.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from Rural Councils resolutions complaining of the complications in the working of the Labourers' (Ireland) Acts; and whether he intends to introduce legislation to promote their simplification.

MR. WYNDHAM: No recent representations have been received. The extent to which the Government was prepared to go in this Session is indicated in the Amendments which I have put down to the Bill of the hon. Member for South Louth. I cannot give any undertaking in respect to next year beyond a promise of careful consideration in connection with the Land Bill I intend to introduce.

Glasnevin Lectures on Bee-keeping.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Vice President of Agriculture was responsible for the appointment of Mr. J. M. Gillies as bee-instructor, and made personal inquiries into his fitness; and what action have the Department taken on the representations they have received from the Irish Bee-keepers' Association about this appointment.

MR. WYNDHAM: The appointment was made by the Department in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it by the Act of 1899. The Department is satisfied as to the fitness of Mr. Gillies for the post. No representations have been made to it by the Association named.

MR. TULLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the experts of the Bee-keepers' Association are satisfied that Mr. Gillies has no qualifications for this post?

MR. WYNDHAM: No such representations have reached me. In a matter of this kind I am prepared to support the action of the Department.

MR. TULLY: His only qualification is that he was on the staff of the *Freeman's Journal.*

Complaint against Dublin Police.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioner of Police has directed an inquiry into the action of the Dublin Metropolitan Police in locking up without any authority from the owners the premises situated at 39, Upper O'Connell Street, Dublin, on the 27th November; and what explanation has been offered by the police authorities to the gentleman who was affected by this action.

MR. WYNDHAM: The culprit—if, indeed, blame attaches to anyone—was not a member of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, but the caretaker of the premises. It was a constable, however, who procured the ladder by means of which the hon. and learned Member for South Donegal descended to the street, and who received the thanks of the latter for the trouble he had taken.

Prison Treatment of Irish Members.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he can state if any Members of Parliament sentenced to imprisonment under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act have been obliged to perform prison tasks such as washing prison clothes.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. This charge was made in an aggravated form on the 27th October by an hon. Member in this House.† It was couched in language which admitted of no interpretation other than that during my tenure of office as Chief Secretary an hon. Member had been obliged to perform a peculiarly degrading task in prison. It was so understood at the time, and could not have been understood to mean anything else, for the hon. Member who preferred it added that the Prime Minister under the old Coercion Act would have shrunk from what he called "a new way of stretching political opponents on the rack." To that charge I give an absolute and unqualified denial.

Mr. TULLY: Had the Member for Cork any authority for stating that he had to wash dirty linen in gaol or elsewhere?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Rock Angus Lighthouse.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will explain why the Irish Lights Board have not yet lighted the lighthouse on the Rock Angus; and whether the Lights Board has prepared any estimate of the cost of the leading lights that would be required; and, if so, to what it would amount.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: As I have already stated in reply to previous Questions, the Commissioners of Irish Lights have explained that they are unable to advise the lighting of Rock Angus unless an extensive system of lights to guide vessels up the Lough to the anchorages of Audley and Cross Roads was adopted in conjunction with it. As such a scheme of lighting would, in the opinion of the Commissioners, be solely for the benefit of local trade, they are unable to recommend that it should be carried into effect at the expense of the General Lighthouse Fund, and consequently they have not caused any estimates to be prepared.

Water Gas in Dublin.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to the deaths from gas poisoning in the City of Dublin; and can he give the percentage of water gas used in Dublin as an admixture; and what is the proportion of water gas allowed in English towns.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention has not been called to any death from gas poisoning in Dublin. According to the Return made by the Alliance and Dublin Gas Consumers' Company for 1901 the maximum proportion in which carburetted water gas was supplied by that Company in admixture with coal gas during that year was 39 per cent. There is no statutory restriction on the proportion of water gas which may be supplied in any part of the United Kingdom. The proportions in which water gas is actually used in various English towns are given in the Annual Return presented to Parliament.

Mr. TULLY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the proportion in English terms?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will refer to the Return, he will be able to see for himself.

Galway as a Transatlantic Port.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received any representations in favour of Galway being made a transatlantic port for the new ocean service between this country and Canada; and if so, what steps does he propose to take in the matter.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade have received no representations in the matter to which the hon. Member refers.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask what the business next week will be?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiii., 904.

THE PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): On Monday and subsequent days we shall go on with the London Water Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Has the right hon. Gentleman yet been able to allocate a day for the consideration of the Shipping Combine Agreements, in pursuance of he undertaking given in his name by the President of the Board of Trade?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the necessary Papers are laid, but I will inquire.

MR. T .W. RUSSELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take the Local Government (Ireland) No. 2 Bill, and when?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot fix a date. I hope some little time may be found, but I cannot give a promise.

MR. TULLY: I thought the right hon. Gentleman fixed a date at the request of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark, who said he represented Ireland!

BETTING.

Ordered, That a message be sent to the Lords, to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on Betting, with the proceedings of the Committee, minutes of evidence, etc.—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed];

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 387.]

LONDON WATER (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1—

(2.40.) MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Deputy-Chairman whether he would be in order in moving to report Progress, so as to give the Government an opportunity of stating their intentions as to the progress of the measure.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said he should have to rule that such a Motion would be out of order under Standing Order 23, which gave to the Speaker or Chairman the right to decline to accept a Motion if he considered it an abuse of the Rules of the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he would like to state his reasons for desiring to make the Motion. The Bill was duly resumed at the end of a very long, exhausting and tedious session. and they were almost at the beginning of a very long, very difficult and very complicated Bill. It was a Bill exceeding in length, and in some respects not far inferior in importance, to the Education Bill on which they had been engaged for so many months. It contained fifty-two Clauses, and five or six Schedules, many of them involving questions of large importance. The Bill dealt also with property to the value of many millions sterling, and that touched very closely the interests of many millions of people.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall have to rule the Motion out of order under Standing Order 23.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will you please read the Rule?

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is as follows:—

> "That, if Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman of a Committee of the whole House, shall be of opinion that a Motion for the Adjournment of a Debate, or of the House, during any Debate, or that the Chairman do report Progress, or do leave the Chair, is an abuse of the Rules of the House, he may forthwith put the Question thereupon from the Chair, or he may decline to propose the Question thereupon to the House."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I submit that this Motion is not an abuse of the Rules of the House. Nothing is further from my intention than to be guilty of any abuse of the Rules of the House. I really do want the House to have an opportunity of considering whether under the extraordinary circumstances of this Bill we shall go on with it. We want to know what are the intentions of the Government in regard to the future of the Bill, and how long it is proposed to sit. I think you should hear my reasons before you decide to refuse the Motion.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee has already taken the Bill into consideration. It is a very unusual step to report Progress at this stage, and I must decline to accept such a Motion. I must rule it out of order. In regard to the first Amendment on the Paper, its right place is on the Schedule, and I therefore rule that out of order.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) failed to understand why the Amendment could not be taken. It referred to the Municipal Corporations Act, and surely the question of whether the appointment should be annual or triennial could be raised on the Clause itself instead of on the Schedule. He might point out that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had himself already taken out the bulk of one Schedule and put it into the Clause, and surely it was competent for other hon. Members to follow his example.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): What I have done has been in accordance with an arrangement made for the convenience of the House generally, in order that an opportunity might be given to debate the general question. There was a clear understanding that if, in the interests of the draftsmanship of the Bill it was found more convenient to replace the words in the Schedule, I should be at liberty to do so. With regard to the Municipal Corporations Act, may I point out that the conditions governing elections are contained in the Schedule of the Act.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON admitted that what had been done had been for the general convenience of the House, but his point was that it was equally in order for any hon. Member to make a similar proposal.

Mr. Edmund Robertson.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It could only be done by general agreement of the House and with the consent of the Chairman. As to the next Amendments, those of the hon. Members for Hoxton and Dundee are also in the wrong place. The former comes under sub-Section 5 of the Clause, and the latter belongs to the 4th Schedule. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Poplar is out of place, because the Committee has already decided that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should be appointed by the Board. The first Amendment of the hon. Member for Cleveland is also a question for the 4th Schedule.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): In the absence of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, I beg to move the Amendment standing in his name.

MR. WALTER LONG: I accept that.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out 'appointed' and insert 'elected.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he wished to propose a further Amendment to secure that the election should be made by the Councils, and he hoped the President of the Local Government Board would favourably consider that point. The object was to secure that membership of the Water Board should be restricted to the county constituent authorities. The list contained in the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman embraced a great number of authorities in the suburbs of London, but a great many others were excluded, and there had been no explanation given why some were included and others were not. There were five counties interested in the Bill outside London, and each of these had its own County Council, and he thought it would be wise to leave it to those bodies to select the members of the Board.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'appointed,' to insert the words 'from among their own members.'"—(*Mr Lough*).

MR. WALTER LONG said it was very difficult to argue the Amendment at this stage of the Bill, and the moving of it was not an altogether fair acceptance of the arrangement he entered into for the convenience of the Committee and of hon. Members on both sides, to bring out of the Schedule the words that now stood in his name, so that they might at once approach the consideration of the important question of the method of appointing the new Board. The hon. Member had not advanced any arguments on behalf of his Amendment, because he was reserving them for the debate on the Amendment of the hon. Member for North-West Wilts. But if the Amendment were adopted it would dispose of the whole question at once, by destroying the scheme of the Bill. He should follow the example of the hon. Member and reserve his arguments also for the real Amendment on which, by common consent, it had been agreed to discuss this very important point.

MR. LOUGH said he had only moved because other Amendments had been ruled out of order, and he wanted to protect himself. He was quite prepared to discuss the whole point on the Amendment of the hon. Member for North-West Wilts, and begged leave, therefore, to withdraw his own Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WALTER LONG then said he would move the Amendment standing in his name without comment, except to say that it had undergone one slight change since it first appeared on the Paper, inasmuch as the district of Foot's Cray, which was a rural district when the Bill was introduced, had since been made an urban district. As it had been agreed that the question should be discussed on the Amendment of which the hon. Member for North-West Wilts had given notice, he would defer stating the reasons of the Government for the proposal.

Amendment proposed,

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out the words from the word 'appointed,' to end of subsection, and insert the words 'as follows:—'Ten by the London County Council; two by the Common Council of the City; two by the Council of each of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Islington, Kensington, Lambeth, St. Pancras, Stepney, and Westminster; one by the Council of each of the other Metropolitan Boroughs; one by the County Council of Essex; two by the Council of the Borough of West Ham; one by the Council of the Urban District of East Ham; one by the Council of the Urban District of Leyton; one by the Council of the Urban District of Walthamstow; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Buckhurst Hill, Chingford, Loughton, Waltham Holy Cross, Wanstead, and Woodford; one by the County Council of Kent; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Beckenham, Bromley, Chislehurst, and Penge; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Bexley, Dartford, Erith, and Foot's Cray; one by the County Council of Middlesex; one by the Council of the Urban District of Tottenham; one by the Council of the Urban District of Willesden; one by the Council of the Borough of Ealing and the Councils of the Urban Districts of Acton and Chiswick; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Brentford, Hampton, Hampton Wick, Hanwell, Heston and Isleworth, Sunbury, Teddington, and Twickenham; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Edmonton, Enfield, and Southgate; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Hornsey and Wood Green; one by the County Council of Surrey; one by the Council of the Borough of Kingston and the Councils of the Urban Districts of East and West Molesey, Esher and the Dittons, Ham and Surbiton; one by the Councils of the Urban Districts of Barnes, the Maldens and Coombe, and Wimbledon; one by the County Council of Hertfordshire; three by the Conservators of the River Thames; one by the Lee Conservancy Board.'"—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON expressed surprise at the action of the right hon. Gentleman in not giving the reasons of the Government for their proposal.

MR. WALTER LONG said it was distinctly a part of the understanding to which the hon. Gentleman was a party, that he should put his Amendment down to afford an opportunity of discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for North-West Wilts.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he could not agree with that. The agreement they came to was this. It was quite obvious that it was desirable to have at once a general discussion on what was after all the main part of the Bill, instead of deferring it until the schedule was reached. He did not see why under the circumstances the debate should be confined to the Amendment of the hon. Member for North-West Wilts. Surely they were entitled to discuss the general proposals of the right hon. Gentleman before they dealt with particular Amendments which would very much restrict the field of debate. Why had not the right hon. Gentleman explained the reasons for their proposal?

MR. WALTER LONG: I gave my reasons at full length on the Motion for the Second Reading.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had read the speeches, but could find no argument in favour of the right hon. Gentleman's proposition. Seeing that six months had elapsed since the matter was last discussed, it would have been only courteous to the Committee to recapitulate some of the arguments in favour of this extraordinary proposal. He rose chiefly, however, to protest against any attempt on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to confine the Committee to a particular alternative proposal to the general scheme. Surely that scheme could stand or fall on its merits, if it had any, but to confine the discussion to a particular proposal was not treating the Committee fairly.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) thought some reply should be made to his hon. friend. London Members had a right to arrange their own affairs, and he interposed simply as *amicus curiæ*. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to an understanding, but an understanding between individual groups of Members did not bind the Committee.

MR. WALTER LONG said that with his long experience the right hon. Gentleman would doubtless agree that an understanding arrived at across the floor of the House by the Minister responsible for and the opponents of a Bill was binding. He could have declined to give the Committee the opportunity they now had of discussing the proposal—he could have adhered to the Bill as drafted, but in order to meet the convenience of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the Committee generally, he undertook to bring these words out of the schedule and put them into Clause 1, on the understanding that the debate should arise on his hon. friend's Amendment.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN agreed that the transference of the proposal from the schedule to Clause 1 was a great improvement for the purposes of regular and reasonable debate. But the question then arose whether, the scheme having been thus brought forward in order that it might be fully discussed, the Committee were not entitled to debate that scheme at large with all possible alternatives to it. Were they to wait until a particular Amendment had been moved, and then be confined to the alternative between the Government proposal and that of the Amendment? Outsiders like himself were entitled to hear the general question stated and discussed. There were a host of alternatives to the Government plan, such as that a Government department should manage the whole business, and therefore it was most important that the Committee should be given a reasonable opportunity of discussing the general question. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should re-state to the House, as no one was more capable of doing, the reasons for his scheme, and allow the Committee to argue the point to their satisfaction.

MR. WALTER LONG said that if the right hon. Gentleman had been present when the question was before discussed he would have understood the reason which led him to adopt the course he had taken. According to *Hansard*, he used the following words:

> "The Committee must clearly understand that if I adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, there should not be a debate on this question over and over again."

It was a matter of perfect indifference to him whether he stated the general reasons in favour of the Government scheme now or on the Amendment, when the first direct attack was made. He would have to state those reasons either now or later; he was prepared to defend his scheme at the proper time; and it was solely in the interest of the Committee that he thought it would have been better to make his speech on the Amendment rather than have to say, in reply to the mover of the Amendment—"I have already made my speech, and have nothing left to say. Having endeavoured to justify my scheme, I have only to ask the Committee to reject the Amendment." To adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition would be to delay the progress of the Bill, and that he was not prepared to do. He had nothing to add to his remarks on the Second Reading. As he then stated, the scheme of representation adopted by the Government included the London County Council, the Metropolitan Boroughs, the adjoining County Councils, and the Urban District Councils. The Rural District Councils were not included, but were given power to receive and a right to obtain water. They were given no representation and no obligation with regard to rating was laid upon them. The Government had selected the Metropolitan Boroughs because they were the sanitary authorities of London; the Urban District Councils, because they were the sanitary authorities of districts surrounding London; the London County Council, because it was the central body of London, and had long taken an interest in the question; and the Councils of the adjoining counties, because there were rural districts which had a right to some representation which they did not get through the Urban District Councils, and because in some of the surrounding districts were to be found the sources which supplied London. There ought to be on the governing body a general representation of all the interests concerned. The whole case had been put with admirable clearness by his hon. friend the Member for Exeter, who, as a member of the Joint Committee, in addressing the House, stated that—

> "The principle of the scheme is the representation on the governing body of all the interests concerned."

This was the only proposal for dealing with the London water question which had ever found general acceptance among the people concerned. When five or six months ago he referred to the Metropolitan Boroughs as being favourable to the scheme, he was speaking of what he knew only by general report, but he knew it more authoritatively now. The Municipalities valued the representation given them because they took an active interest, not only in London as a whole, but in their individual boroughs, and because they found in the scheme a recognition of their rights as representing the citizens of metropolitan boroughs, and London generally.

As to the objection that the body was too large, he had stated it would be impossible to carry out the principle he had laid down if the number were reduced. He had tried in vain every method for reducing the size in the belief that it might be better if the body were somewhat smaller — although he fully thought there would be plenty of work for all the members to do. He started on the principle that London, though not necessarily the London County Council, should have a majority on the new body, and London found its representation in the London County Council and the Metropolitan Borough Councils. The moment that principle was departed from either the superiority of London on the body would be destroyed, or the proportion between London and the outside areas interfered with. Under the scheme of the Government, London had a majority on the governing body, while at the same time what he believed was a fair and strict proportion of representation was given to the surrounding districts. The scheme embodied in the Bill was, in his opinion, not only the best, but the only practicable scheme which could be carried into law, because any attempt to force through a scheme against the will of a great majority of the people of London and the surrounding areas would fail. These were the grounds on which the scheme had been put into the Bill. He had given these reasons on the Second Reading of the measure, and had proposed to state them on his hon. friend's Amendment, but in deference to the wish of the Leader of the Opposition he now repeated them. That being so, he hoped he would not be again accused of want of courtesy if, when dealing with various amendments, he declared that he had already stated the grounds on which the proposal of the Bill was made and the reasons why he thought it should be supported.

*(3.15.) Mr. LOUGH said that with the greatest deference to the right hon. Gentleman he must bear with them at this stage. The President of the Local Government Board had repeated the reasons he put forward upon the Second Reading for proposing this extraordinary body, but he thought

they were most inadequate. The Committee ought not to be treated in this way, because hon. Members could not remember what was said upon the Second Reading. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his attitude and give some stronger reasons for this proposal or else leave it to the Committee to decide whether such an extraordinary body as was now proposed ought to be accepted or not. The principle adopted in this proposal was that certain bodies outside and inside London should be represented, and having adopted the principle the right hon. Gentleman said it could not be carried out except by such an Amendment as he had moved. The body suggested was both impracticable and unworkable, and he should have liked to have heard some further reasons for its number and special construction. It consisted of seventy-three members, fifteen to be appointed by the various County Councils, ten by the London County Council, and five by the others. One of the boroughs was to have two members, certain urban districts five, and the Borough Councils of London thirty-six. Then certain urban districts which worked jointly appointed nine, and the Thames and Lea Conservancies four members, making a total of seventy-one. That was the body as contained in the Bill when it left the Committee. They had since added a Chairman and Vice-Chairman to be appointed by the right hon. Gentleman himself, and so they arrived at seventy-three.

The first thing he suggested was that this body was far too numerous to do its work properly. The right hon. Gentleman treated this question as if it had never been thought of before, and as if Parliament and Royal Commissions had never dealt with it. It had been examined carefully by Royal Commissions and Committees, and it had been discussed frequently during the last ten or twelve years. His complaint was that for twelve years certain principles had been accepted by every Committee and Commission, and by the House of Commons, and now the right hon. Gentleman suddenly brought forward a new proposal which had no authority behind it, and which was entirely different to anything they had had before, and the Government were trying to thrust it down the throat of the House of Commons. In 1891 they had the Report of the Commission presided over by Lord Ridley, and it recommended a Committee of thirty or thirty-five members. Commissions and Committees had sat since on this question and they all agreed that the body should be about half the size of the one now proposed. Where did the right hon. Gentleman get hold of this plan for placing the number at seventy-three? Those who opposed this proposal got their principle from the results of careful examinations and recommendations made by Committees and Royal Commissions and the House of Commons itself. When this proposal to make the number seventy-three went to the Joint Committee which had considered this Bill, they treated it with contempt and scorn. By a majority of six to three the Committee sent this Bill back, and told the right hon. Gentleman to bring up a working body of about thirty or thirty-five members.

What did the right hon. Gentleman do? He caused a communication to be made to the Committee to the effect that the Government had received the decision with profound regret. Surely that was an extraordinary course to take. Why did the Government refuse to adopt the decision of the Committee? The principle of the Bill would not be involved by reducing the size of the body. The object of the Bill was to buy out the water companies and entrust the water supply to a suitable body to manage. Many representatives of the water companies sat opposite, and they could not be interested in the number of this body, although they were interested in getting a fair price fixed for the undertakings before they were taken over. The right hon. Gentleman said there was great difficulty about altering the constitution of the Water Board now, because it had been accepted by those bodies who were interested in it. The Kent authorities had asked that they might be struck out of the Bill, and already many outside counties had made a similar request. The same demand had been made on behalf of Middlesex, Essex, and Hertfordshire. The constitution of the Water Board had not been accepted at all unanimously.

He thought it was an extraordinary statement to say that this proposal had been received with universal favour. The only favourable evidence before the Committee was that given by two gentlemen from the Local Government Board, but they had not much weight against some of the authorities who gave evidence against this scheme. Witnesses came before the Committee from all the great cities, including Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, and Edinburgh, and they all expressed the opinion that it was extremely undesirable to have such a large body if they wanted the work well done. Nearly all the evidence went to show that they ought not to have a body of the size now proposed. It would not be difficult to give a smaller representation. Instead of thirty-six members for the metropolitan boroughs there might be eight or ten, and this result could be arrived at by grouping them. If the Committee thought that this body was unwieldy and represented divergent interests, then the Committee should not hesitate to press upon the Government the desirability of modifying the number even now. There was another feature, which was even worse. The proposed board would consist not only of a great number of people, but of the representatives of a great number of bodies. It would represent the County Councils and Borough Councils inside and outside of London. It was perfectly clear that those bodies would have no common interest. Any experience which the House have had of such bodies was against the setting up of another. The indirect representation given to London was merely the resurrection of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and nobody would say that board worked well when it existed. It seemed to him an extraordinary thing that the Government should propose to practically set up again a body which had been so discredited as that board was. The fact that an Amendment had already been passed placing the new Board practically under the control of the Local Government Board, and giving the power to appoint the first Chairman to the Local Government Board showed the respect with which the right hon. Gentleman felt disposed to treat the body himself. The Chairman and the Vice-Chairman were to be sent in from outside. The result would be that there would be two officials at the head of the body, and the other members would not have a proper sense of responsibility for the great duties they would have to perform on behalf of the citizens of London. They would be mere tools in the hands of these two gentlemen. That was an extraordinary proposal. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had treated the House with much respect in the way he had brought forward this proposal. He hoped the House would take the opportunity which the Amendment would give of considering the matter, and if it did so he felt sure it would arrive at the conclusion that the proposed body was not one that ought to be appointed.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said the hon. Member who had just spoken had not told them anything which they had not heard before. He thought the Committee would be addressing themselves to a more business-like solution of the problem now before them if they proceeded as speedily as possible to the consideration of the Amendment of which the hon. Member for North-West Wilts had given notice.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that one of the things which he did not like about the proposal of the Government was that the number of the Board would be so great that the influence of the individual representative would be infinitesimal unless he was something very much superior to the ordinary representative sent up from the district. As a rule he would not be able to make his influence felt or his voice heard in such a large assembly. If this body was to be so large the ordinary individual would be practically out-classed as well as out-numbered, and it would be better to give the districts protection in other ways than by a mere nominal representative on a body of this size. He saw from the Amendment that some places were left out. Personally he thought it was a pity that all places should not be represented so far as possible, but it was better to leave them out altogether than to give them a false representation. He considered that the appointment of a very small number to represent those vast districts would be a false representation entirely. He would mention three cases in regard to which he had the figures. The Urban Districts of East Ham, Leyton, and Walthamstow, had each a population of about 100,000, and they were each to have one representative. That might be quite right for the present, but these districts were doubling every ten years, and, therefore, they would be grossly underrepresented in the course of a few years. He felt quite confident that the protection these districts would receive by so small a representation on so large a board would not be sufficient. Representations had been made to the right hon. Gentleman through Committees of this House and through bodies outside that so large a body as one consisting of seventy-three members would not be a good working body. His hon. friend had said that the water companies did not care what the number was. He was quite sure that they would prefer a large body because they would be better able to drive a hard bargain. With a small body consisting of men who took a keen interest in the business of the Board, the public interest would be better looked after than by a Board of seventy-three. Whatever was done, do not let them have a resurrection of the Metropolitan Board of Works. All sorts of local boards had been tried in all parts of the country, but never had there been such an egregious failure as the Metropolitan Board of Works. [Cries of "No."] Those who remembered the work they did, and the cost of it would bear him out. [Cries of "No."] He gathered that there were some admirers left of the Metropolitan Board of Works. He did not think that those Gentlemen who had such admiration for the shade of that body that had passed would wish to raise it again to manage their own affairs. Perhaps they would like it to manage the water supply of London and neighbourhood, and perhaps the water directors would like them to deal with. He hoped they would have a body more practical and business-like, more in touch with the people who were to be supplied, and less interested in large money-making concerns than that body was.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said he represented two interests. He was a water company director and a London Member of Parliament. He should like to say one or two words as to the formation of the new body. He entirely repudiated the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Lichfield Division, that the directors of the water companies wished to drive any bargain at all. They wished to have what was fair and reasonable. He personally thought that London might regret what was now proposed by the Bill. The cost might be very large, and it was extremely likely that in years to come it might be realised that it would have been better to compel the companies to do the work under the penalties which could have been imposed upon them in the event of their refusal or failure. But London had made up its mind to buy up the water companies, and as a London Member he desired that the body appointed to carry out the work should be an efficient one in the interest of the ratepayers and the water consumers. He must candidly say that to his mind the idea of creating a body of seventy-three members brought together from all parts, and existing for three years, to carry on a business involving something like fifty millions sterling, was not his idea of the way in which the work could be done successfully. He wished to say this to protect himself hereafter if the scheme did not answer, and London had to pay dearly for the present scheme. His own view, like that of Lord Llandaff's Committee, was that there should be a very much smaller body than the Government now proposed. Speaking with the knowledge of a director who had had to do with the finance of one of the largest of the water companies, he considered that the financial part of this great work rendered it desirable that a smaller body of efficient men should be appointed. He should prefer very much a smaller body similar to a paid Board to look after this great work. This would be one of the largest businesses in the country, and his opinion was that the work could not be well done by such a body as was proposed.

If the Chairman of this new body was efficient he must become the autocratic ruler of the concern. But if he were not the whole thing must fall into the hands of the paid officials. This scheme represented an enormous development of municipal trading, and he looked upon it with misgiving. As a London Member he should be glad to see some modification of the proposal, but as he had the misfortune to be tarred with the brush of being a director he had no right to take part in the vote. His only object was to protect London from what he considered would be a great evil. If the Chairman were efficient he would become an autocrat of this great concern, and that he thought might be the best, but if he was not a good man, the whole of the thing would fall into the hands of the permanent officials. He looked upon this development of municipal trading with great suspicion, and he objected very strongly to any scheme that might open itself to municipal corruption. He regretted he could not support the scheme of the present Bill as regarded the formation of the Water Board.

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*(3.50.) SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said he wished to move the omission of the word "Ten" in the first line of the Amendment in order to insert the word "Fourteen." He submitted this Amendment with that amount of reluctance which must always inspire a Member sitting on that side of the House in moving an Amendment to a Government Bill. But that reluctance was tempered by the conviction that his proposal was in the interests of the water administration of London, and was far preferable to that of the Government. His status in moving this Amendment might, he said, be considered a somewhat slender one. In the first place he was not a London Member, and in the second place he sat as a representative on the London County Council, and the Borough Council of his constituency had passed a resolution in favour of the proposal of the Government. He was, however, perfectly willing to face these disabilities because of the intrinsic merits of the position, and the really overwhelming case that there was against this proposal of the Government.

He ventured to contend that the principles underlying the Government proposals were unconstitutional. Every Committee and every Commission that had previously exhaustively investigated this question had practically condemned the Government proposal and had advocated the identical principle of his Amendment. In 1891 Lord Ridley's Committee recommended a scheme on the lines of his Amendment; Mr. Plunkett's Committee had in 1895 done the same; while in 1899 Lord Llandaff's Commission had advocated the principle of his Amendment, and in doing so he condemned the principle of a large Board. To come to a more recent date, the Joint Committee of both Houses, which sat this year, arrived at the same conclusion. That opinion of the Joint Committee was all the more important because it had been come to subsequent to the re-arrangement of London government by the establishment of the municipal boroughs. Moreover, this Joint Committee was composed for the most part of Conservatives, and after listening to all the evidence put before them they came to a perfectly clear decision, and by an overwhelming vote condemned the proposal of the Government. He would not go into the subsequent tergiversations of that Committee when they substituted another scheme. He knew he was unable to allude to the unprecedented and extraordinary methods by which those tergiversations were influenced and by which the first decision of the Joint Committee was overturned. The ruling of the Deputy Chairman would not permit of his revealing the whole story of that transaction. If a decision could be taken by this Committee on the Government proposal and his—which embodied the principle of the decision which the Joint Committee had come to in its saner and uninterfered with moments—he had not the slightest doubt that the proposal of the Government, which the Joint Committee had never really sanctioned, would be rejected.

Now, to come to the main objections to this Board, which was to consist of seventy-three members, drawn from the London County Council, from the City Corporation of London, from the

London Municipal Corporations, and from certain outside bodies. His first objection to such a Board was that it was constructed on a basis of duplicate representation—which he ventured to say was unprecedented. The system of duplicate representation was introduced in order to include the Borough Councils; and having included them, it became necessary to include the Urban Authority also. The County Council had always been recognised as the water authority for London; and he contended that from the general point of view it was also the sanitary authority for London. The local bodies had not had any dealing in the water question, whereas the County Council had had dealings with it for many years. Under a statute passed by the House of Commons it had certain powers; and had investigated the whole question. Therefore, the County Council should be considered the water authority for London, not the subsidiary borough authorities. In 1899, before Lord Llandaff's Commission, the urban authorities outside London were invited to give evidence; but they replied that they knew, or cared, little about the subject; and that they were quite content that county authorities should give evidence. Had there been any general demand on the part of the Borough Councils for representation on the proposed Board? If there had been a loud demand running back for years, he could understand the difficulty in which the Government would be placed; though he himself would consider that to include representatives of the Borough Councils with representatives of the London County Council would be subversive of the existing municipal system. Before the Joint Committee only fifteen Borough Councils petitioned; and, of these, thirteen petitioned after the 1st January in the present year, when, although the Bill was not introduced, the proposed constitution of the Board was an open secret. Then the idea was brought before them for the first time, that they should have representation on the Board. He would ask why, if these bodies were to be included, should representatives of the County Council be included? That appeared to him to be wrong on every principle of local government, and would be certain to result in a conflict of interests. It seemed to him that County Council representation would be far better than Borough Council representation; and, in saying that, he did not intend to pass any reflection on the Borough Councils, or the urban authorities. They were very important bodies, and had extremely important duties to discharge, but those duties were confined to their own areas, and were of a purely local character.

He saw in the proposed Board a danger to the whole local government of London; and also a danger of confusing duties which related to London as a whole, and duties which related to its several localities. They could not be too careful, in the early days of administrative Boards, to discriminate carefully between local questions, and questions which concerned London as a whole. If that principle were ignored in a complicated city such as London, there would be small hope that municipal life would be conducted on lines compatible with public welfare. To emphasize that point he would make one quotation from an authority which he did not think could be impugned by hon. Members on that side. Lord Salisbury, in a speech he delivered in 1894, said—

> "I am told that there are certain subjects which it is necessary that a central body should conduct and control. I quite admit that there are such subjects. They are principally connected with the main drainage of the Metropolis, with the management of the river which flows through this city, and, if you will, with the water supply. In fact, with those matters which depend upon the natural law that water will run down and will not run up. All these things, which depend upon those natural laws, are necessarily brought under a central management, but if that management were duplicated or were multiplied it would cause confusion."

It was contended by the advocates of the Board that the supply of water was a local question. He contended most strongly that it was not a local question in London; it was essentially a universal question. If it had been local it would have been one of the very matters which would have been given to each individual Borough Council and urban authority. He would ask the Committee to consider the analogy of the main drainage scheme of London at present. It was very little heard of because it was carried out most satisfactorily by one small central committee. Indeed, so satisfactory was the work of that committee that outside authorities had asked to be allowed to come under its administration. He himself could not see very much difference or distinction between extracting foul water from a house and putting pure water into it. What had been done by a small committee in the one direction could be done by a small committee in the other direction. He did not wish the Committee to imagine that he advocated, or had ever advocated, that the County Council should be the sole administrative authority for water in London. He had always opposed that proposal; and when the Committee investigated the only possible alternative—the severance—it was found to be impossible and impracticable.

Once the central principle of local government in London was grasped, the problem, complex as it seemed, became simple. That principle was contained under three heads. The first related to matters concerning London as a county which should be under the central authority of London. The second referred to matters relating solely to a locality without overlapping in any way, which were dealt with by the Borough Councils. Then the rapid development of London beyond its artificial boundaries necessitated a third system of local government, viz., a Board; and in that matter he contended most strongly that the Board must be drawn, not from the subsidiary authorities, but from the county authorities. The Water Board was a very fair example of the last mentioned form of government. In order to carry out its work in a far-sighted manner it would be necessary, from time to time, to transact work in a particular locality for the benefit of other localities. That was always extremely unpopular in the locality concerned. It might be a case of drains, storage, or reservoirs; and if representatives of that locality were on the Board, their primary idea would be the interests of their own area, with the result that they would be very often in conflict with the general interests of water London. He did not speak of the old Board of Works in the derogatory manner that the hon. Gentleman opposite did; but one of its weak points was that there were representatives of outlying districts on it who protected those districts against attack, although the attack was in the general interest; and there would be a great danger, if these small cabals were to be set up again. He did not reflect on the local bodies; but he advocated a Board which would look at London as a whole. It might be argued that the outside counties would send representatives from districts without the water area; but the bulk of the population would be within the confines of water London, and it would be perfectly easy for those outside areas to send in their representatives drawn from that particular part whose interest would be considered as within the water area of London.

With regard to the portentous size of the Water Board — seventy-three members—the House did not want to institute a Water Board which was a large debating body; what was wanted was a small administrative body. He would suggest that this Board should consist of thirty-three members. The fact that provincial corporations had a large number on their Boards was no analogy. Those corporations had various functions to perform which necessitated committees and sub-committees being created. In this case there was only one function to perform, which could be well done by a smaller body. Every authority on this matter strongly disapproved of a large body. The main argument in favour of seventy-three members was that there must be a large body in order to establish the many committees that would have to be established to control the water business in all these areas. The evidence given before the Commission was that some seven or eight committees would be required, but in the opinion of the experts examined two or three would be ample. It was said it would be necessary to create appeal committees in various districts, and again the evidence of the experts controverted that evidence and said such a thing would be most undesirable. The detail work would have to rest with a paid official. He quite agreed that it was not desirable that all the work should be in the hands of a paid official, but a great deal of it must be. With regard to local members being placed on this Board in order that the grievances of their localities might be ventilated, he did not think such a thing was desirable. Under such conditions a grievance had little chance of being remedied. By far the most effective way would be for the locality aggrieved to send a deputation to the central body. That was the practice of the London County Council, and the complaints of deputations were always listened to and dealt with on their merits. It had been pointed out that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Water Board would be paid officials and do most of the work, but he did not envy the man who would have to preside over these conflicting interests. He should be a good administrator, and with a large body like this it would be found that he would be nothing more than a Chairman to keep order. The Board was unwieldy, and from its size was not likely to be a good administrative Board, and no case had been made out for such a large Board when the Committee considered that the only work it would have to do would be to administer the water of the Metropolis.

He had tried to consider this matter from a broad point of view, and the conviction to which he had been forced was that such a Board as this would not conduce to the good administration of the water of London. He made an earnest appeal to the Government to reconsider this matter. They had now arrived at the last month of the year after a most fatiguing session; the House was exhausted; many Members had gone and the debates were becoming more desultory every day. Was it right, under these circumstances, that a great question like this, affecting the health of millions of people, should be dealt with in this manner. The postponement of this Clause would not disturb the other portions of the Bill, which could all be got through; but the constitution of the Board affected the whole municipal power of the country, and was going to affect the finance and health of this vast and increasing city, and therefore he asked the Government to reconsider this proposal. It was a proposal which hardly any business man outside the House approved of, and therefore he appealed to the Government to adjourn this proposal to next session.

Amendment proposed to the Amendment proposed—

Sir J. Dickson Poynder.

"In line 2, to leave out the word 'ten' and insert the word 'fourteen'"—(*Sir J. Dickson-Poynder*)—(instead thereof.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'ten' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

(4.20.) MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Committee had listened to the excellent and well-informed speech of the hon. Member for North Wilts in support of the Amendment, and he could not help contrasting that speech with the one which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman upon the Clause. The President of the Local Government Board was unable to make a good speech, because he had no case. The right hon. Gentleman had made a speech this afternoon in which there was little argument, but what there was had quickly been disposed of by the hon. Baronet. He supported the appeal the hon. Baronet had made to the Government not to press this Clause at the moment, in the interest of the Government for the smooth working of the Bill, and in the interest of economy in the working of it. He hoped they would not force through the House what he believed to be the most extravagant policy that had ever been forced on London. The President of the Local Government Board had stated that he had given the London County Council representation on the governing body because it had taken an interest in the question, and to the other districts because they were affected, but he had not mentioned the extent to which the County Council was concerned. In the course of the next ten years the County Council, out of the County Council rate, would probably have to provide a sum of money ranging from £30,000,000 to £50,000,000, and the body which would have to provide the money, upon whose financial credit and administrative responsibility the money would have to be found to buy out the companies in the first place, and to supply shortages which would inevitably ensue if such a large body as was proposed managed the water supply—that body was entitled, if not to a clear majority, at any rate to more than one-seventh of the representation. Then, what about the other bodies? The Borough Councils would have thirty-six members out of seventy-three.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Member that a specific Amendment had been moved, and the discussion must be restricted to the substitution of "14" for "10."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON pointed out that the object of the proposal being brought from the Schedule to the first Clause was that a general discussion might be taken. If the Committee had understood that they were to be limited to the question between "10" and "14," they would have taken the general discussion before the Amendment had been moved. He trusted the Deputy Chairman would allow the general discussion to be taken, as that was the distinct understanding.

MR. CORRIE GRANT said the hon. Baronet in moving the Amendment, so far from confining his argument to the substitution of "14" for "10," dealt with the whole of the proposal.

* THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that at that time there was no specific Amendment before the Committee, and therefore the hon. Baronet was entitled to discuss the whole subject. The discussion would now have to be restricted to the particular Amendment, but when the Question that the original Amendment of the President of the Local Government Board stand part of the Clause was put, a general discussion could be taken.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) asked whether it was not on the clear understanding that they might discuss the whole Question that the hon. Baronet was allowed to move his Amendment.

MR. WALTER LONG suggested that the debate should be allowed to proceed as though the whole of the hon. Baronet's Amendment were before the Committee, it being understood that the debate should not be repeated at a subsequent stage.

* THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that that could be done with the consent of the Committee and himself. If, however, the discussion was now taken, it must be clearly understood that no discussion would be allowed at the end of the Amendment.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Always provided that Amendments to the Amendment will not be disallowed.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Oh, no.

MR. JOHN BURNS (continuing his speech) contended that the Borough Councils were not entitled to the disproportionate representation proposed, inasmuch as they had no financial responsibility, were not particularly vested with metropolitan knowledge such as would be required, and were not elected or supposed to ask for representation on a body which ought to look at the water question from a universal point of view, without local prejudice or interest. He objected to the disproportionate representation because it would make the Board unusually and unnecessarily large. All authorities on the subject agreed with that. If it was possible for a body of fifteen to manage the main drainage system of London, which, from some points of view, was more important as regarded the health of the people, more difficult to manage, and more dangerous to administer, it was taxing the patience of the House of Commons too much to ask that a mob of seventy-three men, gathered from thirty localities, should deal with the water supply. The proposal was contrary to the recommendations of all the Commissions and Committees that had inquired into the subject, and if the right hon. Gentleman attempted to get up an agitation in its favour he doubted whether even the fifteen or sixteen Borough Councils which had given a most perfunctory assent to the scheme would now be found in its favour. In such a matter, with the enormous sums of money at stake, and the necessity for economy, and for securing a *personnel* of the highest character on the financial side, with a view to obtaining credit, he was not disposed to attach undue weight to the view of the newly elected Borough Councils, who had not this subject before them at the time either of their creation or election. The hon. Members for Chelsea and West Marylebone, and other supporters of the Government, who had some knowledge of the question, had declared themselves in favour of a smaller body, on the ground that the authority now proposed was too large, might be inefficient, would overlap, and was not the proper kind of body for the purpose. The President of the Local Government Board ought to recognise facts. Not a single Conservative Member had yet stood up to defend the constitution of this Board. The hon. Member for Exeter had indeed tried to help the Governmental lame dogs over the stile, but his remarks were in the nature more of apologetics than of a well-informed defence. It had been truly said that some counties which were enamoured temporarily of the Government measure were now realising that with such a large board there was a probability of their localities not being well served, and, in the matter of compensation, being unfairly treated. The Kent Water Company had already expressed a desire to get away from this large body, and some of the Middlesex authorities were anxious to follow the example of Kent and cut themselves off from this Board altogether. It did seem to him that a Board condemned by Lord Cross's Committee, Lord James's Committee, and Lord Llandaff's Committee, failed from the point of view of economy and efficiency. Why did the President of the Local Government Board want the Borough Councils to be represented at all? He believed that it was due to his unreasoning dislike for the London County Council. What was the reason for his dislike? The London County Council would have to find the money, and the right hon. Gentleman should be inclined to conciliate, in the interests of the Water directors, the body which would have to pay the piper. This dislike appeared to have been begotten by a belief that if the right hon. Gentleman disliked the London County Council sufficiently he could use the thirty-six Borough Councillors against the London County Council for political reasons, but if that was the Government view he wished to point out the consequences of holding that view.

No reasons had been given why the London County Council should be discredited and displaced in this way. The right hon. Gentleman asked that the London County Council should be overwhelmed and outvoted on this Water Board by those who might look at the question with more justice to the Water shareholders than the London County Council would. If that was the reason it was unreasonable, unstatesmanlike and unfair. Let the Committee look at the matter from a Borough Council's point of view. What did the Government do? They abolished vestries and put the Councils in their place. And why? Because some of them indulged in malpractices bordering on corruption. When the vestries were replaced by the Borough Councils their numbers were reduced, and the very reason which induced the Government to make this reduction was the reason why they should reduce the number of this Water Board. The Borough Councils were made smaller in numbers and larger in area, and if the new Borough Councils would do their work as they ought to do they could not afford that proportion of their small number which would be necessary for them to be represented on the Water Board to the extent proposed by this Bill.

It had been said that in the future some members of the Borough Councils would have to be provided for education. He thought that instead of education and water it would be better to give them poor law matters to look after. It appeared that the County Council was to be supplanted by bodies which had already got enough to do. With regard to this new body the Bill said that it could purchase by agreement. This meant that a body of seventy-three persons coming together for the first time would have to agree to purchase the water companies either by agreement or arbitration. If purchase by agreement was settled upon then this new body was the wrong one to deal with it. This body would probably decide to purchase by agreement, and they might be driven in their own interest to press harder upon the water shareholders than an arbitration tribunal, or harder even than a body like the London County Council would. There was a danger of this new body treating the companies unfairly. Of course there was also the other alternative that they might treat the companies too generously, which would be detrimental to the interests of the ratepayers of London. They would have experts on both sides. One side would try to get the best bargain they could for the ratepayers, and the other side would do the best they could for the water shareholders, and between those two interests he could see both sides appealing to those thirty-six Borough Councillors who would have no knowledge of this particular subject, and who, with a little political bias, would come down either on the side of the directors or the County Council who might want to have too much of their own way. That course would be neither business-like nor just to the ratepayers or the water companies.

Now that the terms were roughly determined and both sides were satisfied with the arbitration tribunal, now that it was admitted that the County Council was the best authority, it did seem to him to be unreasonable and unfair beyond conception that these thirty-six Borough Councillors should be brought in without any knowledge and experience to determine the price of something which might range from £30,000,000 to £50,000,000. The problem of London government was every year becoming more serious, more difficult and complex. The way in which various vested interests had been allowed in the past to ride rough-shod over the common interest of this vast city had become intolerable, and if this was to be rectified they would have to have central bodies with larger control and wider powers than existing central bodies possessed in order to keep local bodies and companies down to certain lines and conditions by which a minimum of public inconvenience would be caused in carrying out their work. For executive reasons alone it was simply madness to say that the body responsible for the main drainage of London should not have a more or less dominating voice in the executive work of carrying out the water supply of London. By centralising the water and drainage management they would confer, in the matter of comfort and convenience, untold advantages upon London. A centralised body, small in numbers, trusted by the people, as central bodies invariably were now when directly elected, ought not to wait for the complaints of local people. It ought to anticipate local complaint by removing the cause long before it ran to the extent of a public grievance. These sub-committees would be used for preferential treatment by localities, they would be manipulated by officials, and perhaps by workmen. He could see, in connection with contracts, a fine vista of jobbery if this system of local committees was instituted. He objected to the proposed Board for, roughly, the reasons given by Viscount Hampden, a director of the Lambeth Water Works Company. Speaking at the half-yearly meeting of the company on 25th November, he said—

> "Both as a consumer and a ratepayer in London he hoped that, even at the last moment the Government would avoid establishing such a cumbrous, unwieldy, and inexperienced Board as that proposed in the Bill. It had been said that the great advantage to be derived from transferring the undertakings to a public board would be unity of management, but it would be quite impossible ever to obtain unity of management with a board such as that proposed by the Government. They proposed to give representation to every single borough in the metropolitan area. Speaking quite generally, north and west London were supplied at a less charge than east and south London, and it would therefore follow that the representatives, say, of Westminster, instead of being in favour of unity of management, would do their best to oppose in every possible way they could any proposal to alter the incidence of charge or any effort to secure the equalising of rates."

That ought to be conclusive to the President of the Local Government Board. Viscount Hampden's statement was in itself argument enough against the establishment of this Board of 1873.

He would state another argument. Everyone in the House knew that the Thames could not very much longer be depended upon as a source of water supply for London. Middlesex would seek power to go out of this scheme before two years had gone by. Surrey, Hertfordshire, Essex, and part of Kent, would object to remain compulsorily under this Water Board, because they would be under the impression that they could be better served in some other way. The effect of that would be that an extravagantly disproportionate cost in certain districts would ensue, and the water rate might go up. If it went up it might cause people to resist what he believed to be absolutely inevitable, namely, the abandonment of the river Thames as a source of supply in favour of some big project which would require business men, and great engineers with prescience and capacity. They would have to go to Wales or elsewhere for the new supply. What would the Councillors who were on the proposed Water Board do? They would look at this project from a narrow, petty, parochial, and microscopic point of view, because Vestrymen and Borough Councillors who never spend more than £200,000 or £250,000 in a particular locality would not have the moral courage to take up, in a bold way, the work necessary to give London a proper water supply. Failing the adoption of the scheme of the London County Council, which he believed was the best, and which experience would prove to be the only way of dealing with the question, the proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for North-West Wilts was the next best thing, and he would support the Amendment with all the power he could command, because he was extremely anxious that the water supply should be managed by men above local prejudice, and not susceptible to the influences arising out of vested interest. He hoped the President of the Local Government Board would go on with less contentious Clauses and give the question of the constitution of the board consideration between now and March next.

(5.7) SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) said that hon. Members who urged the postponement of that portion of the Bill which dealt with the constitution of the new body must either have forgotten, or taken singularly little account of, a petition signed by a large majority of London Members urging the Government to finish the Bill before the end of the present session. He submitted that that petition represented the preponderating opinion of the water consumers of London. Having given great attention to the subject, he was altogether unable to comprehend the alarm which was apparently felt at the constitution of a body of seventy-three members, and, still more, to understand the enthusiasm with which the constitution of a board of thirty-three members apparently inspired them. The difference between these two bodies was a little matter of detail, but he submitted there was no essential difference in the matter of administration between them. If hon. Gentlemen chose to substitute for the *quasi*-representative body proposed by the Government a small committee of ten, twelve, or fifteen paid members, he could understand that arguments of considerable force might be used in support of that proposal, but whatever arguments were given, it was perfectly certain they would not come from hon. Gentlemen opposite. If one looked beneath the surface it would be seen that the argument did not really turn on the municipal difference between a body of seventy-three or thirty-three members. Whether by coincidence or otherwise, it was a fact that the Water Board proposed by his hon. friend the Member for North-West Wiltshire, and supported by hon. Gentlemen opposite, did give a practical majority and preponderance to the London County Council, whereas in the measure brought forward by the President of the Local Government Board the London County Council was merged in the larger representation. He admired much of the work done by the London County Council, but on the Water Question it appeared to him that the Committee were met by this difficulty, that every outside authority which had expressed a view on the question had petitioned, and urged the petition with the greatest possible force, not to be compelled to form part of a body for the management of the water supply on which the London County Council would have a predominant position. He believed the opposition to any proposal of the Government to give the London County Council a preponderating influence, would have been absolutely insuperable from all the counties round. It had been argued that the proposed Board was unwieldy, but surely the fact that a representative body drew its members from a considerable area, and that opposing views were represented, was a distinct advantage rather than a defect.

The further argument had been advanced that the whole subject of water supply was rather the function of a committee than of an independent Board. He thought that that view arose from a complete misapprehension of the problem they were dealing with. The views of water authorities in various provincial cities had been cited with approval and emphasis, but he submitted that the problem before the Committee now was one differing totally in extent and nature from any water supply scheme at present in force throughout the country. Water London contained a population of six and a quarter millions. It was composed of districts differing mostly in their requirements and their habits, while the sources of the water supply were widely separated from each other. He could not find the smallest analogy between the circumstances either of Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, or the other large provincial towns, and the problems which now confronted them in London. An interesting paper had been put in by the London County Council, in which the figures concerning thirty-nine large towns in the provinces were given. But there was no analogy whatever between the water supply of London, with its six millions of inhabitants, and the water supply of towns whose population did not exceed 200,000. It had been argued on the basis of these figures that the committees were totally unnecessary, but if the details of the statement were read it would be found that of the thirty-nine large towns all but eleven worked through sub-committees; and that the number of sub-committees increased in direct ratio with the increase of area and of population. That appeared to him to destroy altogether the argument that the proposed Water Board, consisting of seventy-three Members, would be inefficient. It was perfectly obvious that the work of the Water Board would be conducted almost entirely through sub-committees. It had been repeatedly brought forward that a better proposal to the one now before the Committee would be Lord Llandaff's—viz., a Board composed of thirty members; but he thought that in taking that view the members of the London County Council were somewhat illogical; because, when the Llandaff Commission reported in favour of a small Board, a deputation waited on the Government, and Mr. Mackinnon Wood stated that he had not been able to find a single man to approve of that Report. A small Board, that Gentleman said, was not representative enough, but too administrative. They were, however, now told that the proposed Board of seventy-three members was too representative and not administrative enough. The real fact of the matter was that the opposition to the Bill came from those who would be satisfied with no solution but that which left the London County Council in command of the field.

Then it was said that the ratepayers were not sufficiently represented on the proposed Board. He confessed that the reasons adduced for that criticism did not appear to him to be well founded. He maintained that the real wishes of the ratepayers and water consumers of London would be better represented in a Board of seventy-three than in one of thirty-three. And it went without saying that the representation would be more complete in a Board of such numbers than on an administrative Board of twelve or thirteen. He could understand the argument against the new body as being inexperienced, and as not being able to get the best of the discussion when settling terms with the Water Companies; but it was forgotten that the Bill itself had laid down in precise terms the method of transfer and the conditions. He drew attention to Clause 23, which established the Board of Arbitration—

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member must not discuss any future Clause. I think I have already allowed the hon. Member too much latitude in regard to the financial part of the Bill.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT said he would pass from the financial Clause. His only object was to show that the danger apprehended in regard to the constitution of the Board from the fact that it was composed of seventy-three members was largely discounted by the fact that the financial business of the transfer would rarely come before them. Attention had been almost entirely confined to one point, viz., the number and the constitution of the necessary authority. Outside that, there appeared to be a general consensus of opinion that the proposal before the Committee was acceptable. His own view was that it was not only acceptable, but that it was in the highest degree ingenious; and he believed most sincerely that if it were accepted by the Committee it would provide a good working solution of the question which had been too long before the community. He therefore urged the Committee most strongly not to be diverted from the examination of the real point of the Bill. If the argument of those who had—if he might use the term without offence—an axe to grind, were put aside, those who desired that the body to be created the sole authority for water, outside the London County Council—there was no alternative suggested to that submitted in the Bill.

*MR. MELLOR (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) said he was not going himself to urge on the President of the Local Government Board to withdraw this Bill, although he was not enamoured of it. He hoped that a good Bill would be passed, because, as the hon. Gentleman who spoke last had said, this question had been a long time before the House, and it was desirable that it should be settled. He was, however, bound to say that he thought that it was very late in the session to discuss so important a Bill. When they considered the very large amount of money that was going to be invested in this matter, all the difficulties of the question, and the extreme importance of it to the ratepayers, he was sorry that it had come up to be dealt with now, when they would not be able to give it the attention which it deserved. He joined in the suggestion that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board should accept this Amendment now, and then those difficulties in regard to the rest of the Bill would be very small, and that he would get it passed without much difficulty. If it should turn out that this Amendment would not cause the Bill to work properly, the right hon. Gentleman had the remedy in his own hands. He could bring in a Bill to alter it next session, and with the Government majority at his command the amended Bill could be passed easily. This was not a political matter in any sense. It was a pure matter of providing London with an adequate supply of the best water. It was absurd to look at it from a political point of view. He was a member of Lord Llandaff's Commission, and it was as a member of that Commission, and not as a ratepayer of London, that he was now speaking. Why should the Government force upon them this Board of seventy-three, when all the authorities were against it? Lord Llandaff's Commission, which sat for two years, proposed a body of thirty-three; and he was sure that if the question had been put in that Commission whether there should be a Board of of seventy-three or to leave the water companies alone, the water companies would have been left in possession. There was much more to be said in favour of the water companies than had been heard in this House.

This was purely a question of administration. Could it be seriously suggested that any one who read the evidence taken before Lord Llandaff's Commission, or the evidence before the Select Committee, that seventy-three was the best number for administration? The Select Committee decided by two to one in favour of Lord Llandaff's Report, and the conclusion they arrived at was arrived at after considerable consideration and thorough examination of the evidence. What was the use of a Royal Commission if Parliament was not going to attend to its recommendations, especially when the Commission made a unanimous Report? All the eight men on the Commission started with different views, and finally, by the force of the evidence they heard, they joined in a unanimous Report. The real reason why the number of thirty-three for the Board had been fixed upon was this: they had to inquire as to whether it was prudent, for financial reasons, that the water companies should be bought out by some body, and if they were to be bought out, by what body. They came to the conclusion that it would not be advantageous to the ratepayers that the water companies should be bought out by any body unless the greatest possible care were taken for future administration, and that that should not be to the disadvantage of the ratepayers of London. His objection to seventy-three members was that the people who returned the Borough Councils were also represented on the County Councils, and practically got their representation twice over. The County Council was the proper authority to be represented on the water board. The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that he had arrived at the number seventy-three after a great deal of consideration and thought. The Commission came to the conclusion that it was not to the advantage of the ratepayers that the water companies should be bought out unless the greatest possible economy and care were afterwards exercised in administration. They recommended a board of thirty-three members who should, as far as was possible, be experts—people well acquainted with water administration, who would administer the water in the most economical way and prevent waste. Of course, the Commission supposed that the experts would, to a great extent, be taken from among the old directors of the water companies, who had practical experience of the business. He hoped the Government would, even at this the eleventh hour, listen to their suggestions. If they did, no one could blame them, and it never could be reasonably suggested that either the Government, or the Bill, had been damaged by such a course. The Opposition simply wanted to get for the ratepayers of London the best possible administration, in order that no reproach might rest upon Parliament when the Bill began to work. Thirty-three members was quite enough. The Government's scheme would result in the borough and county representatives differing from each other, and the system of Progressives and Moderates would be reproduced. It was most desirable to avoid anything in the nature of debating; what was wanted was administration. He spoke not as a Member of the Opposition but as a member of the Royal Commission, which was a very strong one, and came to a unanimous conclusion after reading the evidence. That surely was a good argument in favour of adopting their recommendations, and he hoped under those circumstances the Committee, at all events, would not agree to the proposal of the Government.

(5.38.) MR. WALTER LONG said he had little to add to his previous remarks. The right hon. Gentleman complained in almost pathetic terms that the Government had not adopted the precise recommendations of the Royal Commission. He was surprised, however, that the right hon. Gentleman should have raised the question on the Amendment of his hon. friend, which, whatever the views of the Government might be, was not based on those recommendations. The reason why they departed from the recommendations of the Commission was very simple; it was because they had to deal with this question as practical men who had to face a practical difficulty. As a matter of fact, the advice given by Royal Commissions was very seldom taken; their recommendations, unfortunately, were very often put on one side. The right hon. Gentleman said this was not a political question, and he was quite sure the statement was made in perfect good faith, but it was rather remarkable that nearly all those who had denounced his proposals were Gentlemen who sat on the opposite side of the House, or those who held similar opinions to hon. Gentlemen opposite. His hon. friend who moved this Amendment did not represent any London constituency; it was true he was a member of the London County Council—a Moderate—and he appeared now as the advocate of the Progressive policy. That was rather a curious mixture, which did not suggest to him that he should have much regard to the suggestions of the hon. Member.

The right hon. Gentleman opposite assured them that if they accepted the Amendment all their difficulties would disappear. But did the right hon. Gentleman really believe that hon. Members on that side, who in a vast majority represented London, and who had supported the Bill with the approval of their constituents, would surrender the policy with which they had associated themselves in order to adopt that of hon. Gentlemen opposite, or of his hon. friend s A more remarkable receipt given to a Government for the easy carrying on of its business was surely never heard. While the Government might get rid of some difficulties by adopting the suggestion of the Party opposite, they would be only raising fresh difficulties which would make the passage of the Bill more difficult. It was impossible to approach this question in the same way as it could be approached if the country were new and there were no existing bodies. It was impossible not to recognise that there were a lot of metropolitan and urban authorities who, up to now, had failed to come to an agreement on this matter, and who had to be considered. Why all these attacks on the Borough Councils? Why should it be imagined that the County Council was endowed with every virtue and the Borough Councils with every vice? Why was it supposed that the County Council could do anything they set their hands to, and that the Borough Councils could do nothing? There was no justification whatever, in fact, for these attacks. He contended that it was impossible to ignore the position of the London water area. That area extended much beyond the limits of the London County Council, both in extent and population, and it would be found that much of the money spent for the various purposes of water supply would be spent outside the area of the London County Council. It was rapidly growing, and rates would increase proportionately. Apart from actual numbers, not only was it wise to select the governing body from these constituent authorities, but if they were to create a body to deal with the great sanitary questions involved, it was natural and just to go to the sanitary authorities of the area concerned. He hoped hon. Members would not suggest that these metropolitan boroughs should only be represented through the County Council, because he was not prepared to adopt the suggestion that the Government should shut out from any place on this body the metropolitan boroughs which had shown themselves so thoroughly capable of looking after the affairs of those boroughs, and who, he believed, were going to add largely to the interest and energy which must be bestowed on municipal work in London if the Metropolis was to vie with the work done in the other great towns.

He did not believe that any other plan than that adopted by the Government was practical or workable. He saw no reason to alter the view at which he had arrived after carefully investigating this question, namely that if they were to obtain the support and agreement of all the people they must secure that there should be on the Board representatives of all the districts concerned. In that way only would they be able to secure a Board which would have the confidence of Water London. If, as was alleged, a Board consisting of seventy-three members would be a mere debating assembly, what became of the great corporations and County Councils? At present London was supplied with water by eight companies controlled by eighty different directors. It would be necessary to divide London into districts and work through committees—for all the detailed work would have to be done in that way—and he did not believe it would be found in practice that there was one man more in this new body than would be wanted for the adequate discharge of their duties. It was amusing to note that the decision of the Committee upstairs as to numbers, upon which so much stress had been laid, was not particularly unanimous, because when the Committee were discussing the desirability of reducing the number to thirty-five, upon going into details of this particular question they raised the number to sixty-nine. The Committee found that unless this representation was given it would be impossible to secure the common agreement essential to the smooth working of such a body. These were the reasons which led the Government originally to put the proposals in the Bill, and they were the reasons which would make the Government adhere to the proposals, and thus render it impossible for the Amendment of the hon. Baronet to be accepted.

(6.0.) MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that the word "practical" ran through the right hon. Gentleman's speech, but he had listened in vain for some distinct indication of how, in the right hon. gentleman's mind, the "practical" nature of a proposal was to be tested. Above everything he should have thought practical considerations required that this Board should comprise a body able to proceed at once efficiently to the business of conducting the arbitration. The first business of the Board would be to enter upon the arbitrations so that the awards might, if possible, be given before the "appointed day." That was why, in the view of many Members who were anxious that there should be a temporary body which could conduct this business, the refusal of the right hon. Gentleman to entertain a compromise made the constitution of the Water Board a much more serious matter.

MR. WALTER LONG: What compromise?

MR. HALDANE: To deal with the constitution of the Water Board in a later measure.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not understand the surrender of half the Bill to be a compromise.

MR. HALDANE asked the Committee to consider the position in which this body would find itself. If it had to deal only with the matters spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman it would be different. But the arbitrators would probably say, "The sooner we set to work the better," and these seventy-three gentlemen, drawn from all quarters of the London water area, not elected by any homogeneous method, but appointed by bodies holding the most divergent views, would have to prepare for and conduct arbitrations against the most skilled experts who for years had been steeped in the business of conducting these references. The Board would have no officials, as the officials of the companies would not come under their control until a later stage in the proceedings, nor would they have the skilled assistance of the London County Council. He really could not see how, with this body of seventy-three gentlemen, it was possible to have this business conducted with that degree of efficiency which the people had a right to expect. That was why some hon. Members considered that it would not have been a surrender of half the Bill, but a useful and easy compromise, to have dealt with the constitution of the Water Board in a separate measure, in the meantime passing a provision to enable some body — the County Council would have done very well—which had all the machinery for conducting these references at hand, to undertake what after all was the most serious business. Financial questions also would arise before the unfortunate body had anything like an efficient staff at its command. He had looked in vain for evidences of the enthusiasm of London Unionist Members for this measure. Where were the hon. Members for West Marylebone and the Epping Division of Essex, both of whom were keen on the Water Question? They were absent, and the right hon. Gentleman was backed only by a few depressed-looking supporters of the Government.

MR. WALTER LONG: We might return the compliment.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are but seven.

MR. LOUGH.: There are six out of seven hon. Liberal Members present.

MR. HALDANE (continuing) said the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the difficulty of working out the scheme of any of the Commissions on the subject, and the necessity, again, of proceeding on practical lines. It was, therefore, somewhat peculiar that the scheme ultimately adopted should have differed in such an extraordinary degree from anything that had ever been suggested. Seventy-three was a great contrast to thirty. The consideration that should have been uppermost was that of securing a practical and efficient body rather than that of adequately representing this or that authority. He had no prejudice against the Metropolitan Borough Councils, and would like to see them adequately represented, but it should be "adequate representation" in relation to the question with which the Bill dealt. Certainly without entirely swamping the London County Council, which was a practical body, and had conducted its business with great vigour and efficiency, the Government could have given the Borough Councils adequate representation by grouping or otherwise. A feebler argument from the practical point of view in support of any measure had seldom been heard.

It was said that the Board would require all these members because it was likely to have to separate itself into local Committees. He would have liked that idea to be worked out, because, from a perusal of the Bill, he was unable to see how that part would come in. Questions of policy would concern the water area as a whole. If questions of appeal and valuation such as were dealt with by borough assessment committees were to come before the Board, one could understand the desirability of local committees, but this body would have nothing to do with questions of ratable value and so forth. He presumed that the water supply was to be dealt with on a comprehensive and scientific scale. If so, these things would be reduced to rules to a far greater extent than was at present the case, and even if there were a certain number of appeals they would not be sufficiently numerous to require the enormous number of committees the right hon. Gentleman seemed to indicate. The real work that this body would have to do was, in the first place, to purchase the undertakings upon proper terms; next, to look after the finance—a matter requiring all the expert advice that could be obtained; and then there would be the question of carrying on the undertakings with the existing staff, as far as possible, on certain general principles which it would be for this body to work out. He felt quite sure that if by putting on this enormously heterogeneous representation they meant that the interests of the localities were to be made permanent, they would get themselves into great trouble. They wanted a policy which would apply to the whole area, and it was much better to deal with these matters upon general principles. He was sure they would have questions enough to deal with without bringing in local problems. If one looked at this matter from a practical point of view the only really practical way to get a thoroughly efficient administration of the system of water supply would be to secure a body altogether free from sectional interests, and be sufficiently moderate in numbers to work out its policy without the confusion which would result from entrusting this work to what was practically a new Parliament for London. It was to be reg etted very much in the interests of London that this Board had been framed as it had been. He believed in the advice of the experts and he thought that upon this occasion the Government were going against the great body of expert opinion upon this matter, for the Royal Commission and the committees which have considered this question were against any such proposal as this, and he could only look upon the future of this new body with grave apprehension. He did not really think that the proposals made by the right hon. Gentleman had got half-a-dozen really convinced supporters besides himself.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he rose to give his support most thoroughly to the present Board being constituted at the number of seventy-three. He did so because the outside area was a very important one, and because it was the one from which they got all their water supply. When they came to look at the Bill and counted the number of representatives on the Water Board from these outside areas they would see that of the total of seventy-three there were twenty-five men to be co-opted from those outside areas and they were men who had managed the water supply of those areas, in the past in a most thorough and efficient way. He had been on the London County Council for some years, and had seen the members of the Council there, who worked very hard, but he doubted whether on the London County Council there were men with the same capacity as those who would be chosen from those outside areas. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Haddington, who had just sat down, complained of what the President of the Local Government Board said in regard to the work to be done by this Board. They knew that the Board would have to buy up all the water companies, which would mean an outlay of between forty million and fifty million pounds.

On this Board of seventy-three there would be all sorts of committees required. This Water Board would have to take charge of an area which had up to the present been looked after by the Boards of eight water companies, embracing some eighty different representatives. Therefore the Board they were asking for of seventy-three members was no large number to deal with this important business. There would be the finance committee, committees to deal with the water supply and also with the waste of water. A great many arguments had been adduced as to what they had to do with regard to the water supply, but he thought they would have a much better supply brought to them by the local authorities in outside areas, who ought to look after their own water courses and see that there was no wasting of water. They would require committees to take charge in those outside areas, and it seemed to him that this number of seventy-three was little enough when they came to consider the large area to be dealt with. Last year he took up the subject of the future dealing with this water question, and he then thought it was advisable to have a smaller Board. In the meantime, after carefully considering the question, he quite agreed with the President of the Local Government Board that they must have a larger Board. It had been said that when they came to deal with the question of purchase with a Board of seventy-three, that those gentlemen who were on that Board would not be able to deal satisfactorily with the arbitration question. But surely they would be able to do this, for they were not going to decide the question. They were going to appoint arbitrators, and they would hear the demand of the water companies, and members of the Water Board were sure to be men who wished the companies to have proper value for their property, and they would be able to instruct learned gentlemen like the hon. and learned Member opposite to argue their case, and see that only the proper value was given for the interests of the water companies.

The hon. Member for Battersea, if he might say so, appeared to wander all over the place in dealing with the question of the constitution of the Water Board and what it would be. He thought the main question they had to deal with was what was to be the authority and how was it to be constructed. His opinion was that this Water Board, as proposed by the President of the Local Government Board, would be an effective body, would not be too large, and would be able to do the work most efficiently. The whole question of passing this Bill into law was a very small one, and practically resolved itself down to the constitution of this Water Board. He had yet to learn that any of these different localities had disputed this question. No speaker in the debates on this Bill had said that these different localities chosen by the Bill ought not to have their representatives. It was necessary that all these localities should be represented, and when they came to think that twenty-five of the Members of the Water Board represented outside areas, surely the water consumers of London ought to have somebody from the different Metropolitan Boroughs to represent London interests as well as the London County Council. It was absolutely necessary that they should have a larger number of representatives on the Water Board than the outside areas had. As there were twenty-five representatives of the outside areas, it was necessary that the rest of London should have some forty-eight representatives to make up the seventy-three. As to the question of the proportion of representation to be given to the different bodies, he thought the London County Council had got too much work to do now. The right and proper thing was that the London County Council should have about ten representatives, as was promised by this Bill, because they had to deal with the drainage question. London was a most extraordinary city and the question of the future water supply and the great waste of water which was continually going on ought to be considered. The streets of London were mostly paved, and the roofs caught the rain, and consequently the water was taken immediately down the drains to the sea. It was estimated that in London alone about 120,000,000 gallons of water every day were taken right out of London and poured into the sea, and that was one of the reasons why London and the London water area was becoming so short of water. There was less and less water every year in London, because the whole of that which fell within the London area found its way immediaately to the sea. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would stick to their number of seventy-three members for the Water Board, and he thought the distribution of the representation, as now proposed, would be satisfactory to the House and also to ratepayers of London.

*(6.28.) MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said the question of the constitution of the Water Board for London, although it was one which did not concern so much the rest of the country, yet did concern the question of local government generally. They all desired that the principle of devolution should be carried out, and therefore they had an interest in the constitution of the future Water Board of London. The hon. Baronet the Member for North-West Wiltshire had no axe to grind or any personal interest to serve

in going against his Party upon this occasion. He (the hon. Member) also disclaimed any Party motive in desiring to see the London Water Supply made efficient. There were many objections to the London County Council being created the sole authority, because there were so many other districts included in the London water area which were not in the London County Council district, and therefore, it was only right that they should be represented. He could not understand the expressions used by the hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich, who appeared to think that if the Borough Councils had no special representation, there was a danger of them being swamped by the representatives of outside areas. He wondered what hon. Members would think if small portions of their own constituencies wanted separate representatives in Parliament because they were afraid of being swamped by the whole division. Members who represented the London County Council would represent the whole of their constituents. He thought there was something in what had been said as to its not being desirable that some corners of London should be specially represented. He could not help being amused at the statement of one gentleman, who said that certain places ought to have representation because in their areas originated some of the water supply. He thought that the further from London the water used in the Metropolis originated the better it would be for the people. One of the drawbacks of the Government proposal which the Amendment was designed to correct was the very great inequality of the constituencies which were to be created under this Clause. Camberwell, with a population of 258,000; and Stoke Newington, with 51,000, were each to have one member on the new Board. He was informed that in each of those districts there was room for extension. Why in the scheme proposed was there such an inequality of representation? In proportion to the size of a representative body was the amount of work done. The larger the body, the less the work. He did not know a better illustration of that than this House itself. The more talk, the less work. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] He was glad to find that sentiment received the approbation of hon. Gentlemen on the other side. He did not know until the President of the Local Government Board told them that the Borough Councils would have to levy the rates. He was under the impression that the County Council would have to do it. Certainly, if any borrowing had to be done, they would get the benefit of the credit of the whole of London from the County Council, rather than the borough point of view. It seemed to him that the hon. Member for Exeter was rather *mal à propos* when he said he could not find the smallest analogy between the population of Water London, of six and three-quarter millions, and that of any of the large cities of the country. Manchester had 849,000. Well, the only difference was that of population and area, and there was no difference in principle between 849,000 and 6,000,000. [Cries of "Agreed."] Then, why did they not apply the provincial principle to this area?

Hon. Members who were opposed to the Government proposal supported the Amendment because they objected, in the first place, to such a large body, and, in the second place, to the duplication of representation. The President of the Local Government Board said the hon. Baronet the Member for North-West Wilts represented the policy of the Progressive Party of the London County Council. If he was rightly informed, this was the policy of the London County Council as a whole, and not merely of the Progessive Party. It was a very unfortunate circumstance, at all events, that when this duckling, which was hatched by a former Government corresponding to the present, was going into the water, its original parents should be afraid of it. He was only sorry that the Government could not trust the London County Council to the extent of giving it fourteen out of thirty-three representatives. The President of the Local Government Board spoke as if it were somehow a matter of principle that not only should the County Council be deprived of a majority to start with, but that it should be in a small minority. Surely the interests of the London County Council and those of the other Councils included in the Board of Management did not clash to the extent that there would be cliques and intrigues. These were more likely to arise among the representatives of very much smaller areas, who could hardly be expected to take as broad and liberal views as the representatives of the London County Council. He had endeavoured to import no Party spirit into this discussion. It was in the interest, not only of London but of the country at large, that great care should be taken in the formation of those bodies, who were in future, he hoped, to relieve Parliament of many of its most irksome duties, and it was in that spirit that he desired to support the Amendment.

MR. D. J. MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow) said he would like to make a remark or two on behalf of the outside areas. In the area with which he had to do there was a population of over 100,000, and the ratable value was over £2,000,000. The people of that district were very interested in this Bill, and they were decidedly in favour of it. The Committee had heard a great deal about the increase of population. He remembered when fifty years ago in the district which he represented there only 5,000 people. Not only had there been the enormous increase of population during that period, but there was still a large amount of ground which was yearly being covered with houses, so that the ratable value in the district would increase to a very large extent. Looking to the immense area over which the new Board would have to do its work, he thought the Committee would see that when the members were split up into small committees there would be no more than necessary. Where there was a very large area to administer it was very difficult to get attendances if there was only a small body. The result was that the attendances became smaller and smaller, and then the work was done practically by permanent officials. He hoped the Committee would support the proposal of the Government.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he was astonished to hear the hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich support the proposal of the Government. On the Second Reading of the Bill the hon. Baronet made it a matter of complaint that the Board was too large, the number then proposed being sixty-nine. He did not understand the suggestion of the President of the Local Government Board that the Unionist Members were pledged on this subject at the last General Election. Even the right hon. Gentleman himself was not pledged to the precise numbers of the Board. At the last County Council election, when this issue was before the people of London, an overwhelming majority in favour of purchase and control by the County Council was returned. The present Bill was not in existence then. Had they been pledged since? He was a fairly careful student of London affairs and he did not recollect the occasion when they were pledged. The President of the Local Government Board on the Second Reading of the Bill said they were not pledged to the number. He told the House that he would leave the number an open question.

MR. WALTER LONG: No. Quote my words.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had not the words, but certainly the right hon. Gentleman said he was not pledged to the actual number. On 3rd March the right hon. Gentleman said that he would consider in the freest possible manner the number of the governing body.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had carefully guarded himself against a general reduction, but stated that he would be glad to consider proposals distributing the numbers amongst the Metropolitan boroughs.

DR. MACNAMARA said that he had not taken the right hon. Gentleman's speech in that sense. He did not know of any London Unionist Member who was pledged through his constituency to anything like this number of seventy-three. At the last election of the County Council, the issue submitted to the people was, by the Progressives, purchase and control, financial and otherwise, under the County Council, and by the Moderates purchase. The result was a large majority in favour of the Progressive programme. Personally, he had been and was entirely opposed both to the number and constitution of the Board proposed by the Government. He was opposed to it because there was nothing in any recommendation of any Committee or Royal Commission to support it, and all the best expert testimony called before the Joint Select committee strongly repudiated the idea of making the Board so large as was proposed by the Government. Mr. Deakin of Liverpool thought that thirty was a sufficient number; Sir B. Leach said that in Manchester the Water Committee consisted of eighteen members, and he thought that sixty-nine was too large. The Deputy Lieutenant for the city of Edinburgh approved of twenty-five, and the Town Clerk of Glasgow twenty-eight. The latter said that sixty-nine was too unwieldly a body, and too unworkable, and that it would militate against the general efficiency of the Board. The other expert witnesses approved of a body consisting of between eight and twenty-six. The right hon. Gentleman said that when the Joint Select Committee recommended thirty-five, he thought there was little to complain of, but that when he came to consider the matter, from a practical point of view, he felt bound to make it seventy-three. Now if thirty-five was utterly impracticable what became of the recommendation of the Royal Commission and of the Committees, which were all in favour of a body of from fifeen to thirty? On 6th May, in the Joint Select Committee, Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald said that the decision of the Joint Committee had been considered by the Government with profound regret, and then he went on to say that London could only have a fair representation on the Board by giving representations to the Metropolitan Boroughs; while Mr. Bremer, of Westminster, said that the decision of the Committee had been received with the utmost regret, and he hoped that they would have an opportunity of being heard. The Joint Committee were, he contended, compelled to come back to the representation of the Metropolitan Boroughs because the Government practically had had it thrust upon them. He was deliberately against the representation of the municipal boroughs which were represented by the London County Council. He did not say a word against the *personnel* of the Municipal Boroughs or the fitness of the men. This was purely a question of financial propriety. They were told that the boroughs were to raise the money to take over the Water Companies' concerns. Nothing of the sort. The County of London would indent the money as the fiduciaries of the rates of the County of London. He maintained that from the point of view of pure financial propriety there was no justification for the representation of the Municipal Boroughs on the Water Board, when most of the money came from the London County Council. The inclusion of the Metropolitan Boroughs was a difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman had created for himself, and he would have to arrange a scheme of representation with something like equality, because it was unfair to give equal representation to unequal area and populations. The whole thing was unjust and absurd in the utmost degree.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, Pudsey) said he was not a London Member, and had no personal interest to serve in advocating any point of view. He had no axe to grind, and it seemed to him that Members who did not represent London interests were more likely to regard this question in a judicial frame of mind. It was because he had been for many years a member of a Municipal Corporation and had sat on a Water Committee for a long period that he wished to make a few observations. In his humble judgment the scheme of the Government was unfair, unjust, and impolitic. It was founded on bad principles. It appeared to him to formulate those old feelings of distrust of the London County Council, which they had ventured to hope were dwindling. He would look for a moment at the history of the Bill. It was introduced by the Government in the early months of the year, and the Second Reading was passed after a discussion of two days; but he did not think that the London Members were then very vehement in their support of the Bill. Hon. Members would not deny that there was most vehement opposition to the proposals of the Government in the two days debate of March this year. In this Bill the Government had evolved from their inner consciences a multiplicity of Water Boards, and that was because the Government were, practical, men, as against the experts who sat on the Royal Commission to consider this question. They had flown in the face of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, which had sat for two years to consider the question and which had arrived at a unanimous conclusion. But that was not the only body which had deliberated upon this matter and formulated an opinion. A Joint Committee, which the Government itself had set up, which might have been described from its composition as a most biassed and partial Committee, had come to a conclusion almost identical with that of the Royal Commission. They recommended that the Water Board should be on the lines sketched out by the Royal Commission. When the Committee had come to that conclusion, the Government had endeavoured to go behind their judgment. The Committee then considered that matter afresh. No further material facts were brought to their notice except that the Borough Councils desired representation, and even on that the borough councils were not unanimous, for no less than twelve of the metropolitan boroughs condemned the suggestion that they should be associated with the Water Board. Notwithstanding these facts, the Government was attempting to rush this Bill through the House. The Bill was a big one of fifty-seven Clauses, and that was not the course to adopt. The Government in this matter claimed to be influenced by the London Members, but the County Councils were a far better reflex of the opinion of London on this matter. They were elected by the ratepayers, who, in many cases, were not directly represented by Members in this House. The London County Council was strongly opposed to this Bill. Why should the Committee go behind the County Councils to obtain representatives elected on the same franchise as the County Councils? He was strongly of opinion that this borough representation was a mistake, the various representatives would be apt to push their own interests rather than deal with the matter on broad lines. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell, that if once borough representation was allowed it could not stop there. Everybody in the area covered by the Water Board must also be given representation. Other great cities in this country had outside areas as large in proportion as London's outside areas, but they did not co-opt members from them. They simply took the water and paid for it. So far as sub-committees were concerned, a Board of thirty-five members could split itself up into as many sub-committees as were required to administer the water of London. If the Government insisted on a Board of seventy-three members he could only say that in his opinion, although there would be volumes of talk, very little business would be done. He supported the Amendment.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said he should like to put the view of the London resident, as he was so unhappy as not to share the views of his otherwise distinguished representative. He held that the President of the Local Government Board was not entitled to point to the opinion of his supporters, who were representatives of London, as at all reflecting what the opinion of London was on this Bill. The London County Council ever since its creation had been constantly Progressive, but the Parliamentary representation of London had been quite the contrary. There was no parity of reasoning in the right hon. Gentleman's argument in comparing this Water Board with provincial municipal authorities. On those provincial bodies there was a large variety of functions necessitating a multiplicity of Committees. This Board had only one function. Upon the same principle as Parliament placed the control of main drainage and sewage upon the County Council and devolved upon it those matters which appertained to the whole Metropolis in contradistinction to particular units, so they ought to impose upon the Council the duty of looking after the water supply. The Government would be well advised to pay attention to the desire of Londoners as expressed through their municipal authority, the County Council, in this matter.

(7.24.) MR. WALTER LONG rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 607.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Balfour,Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dewar,SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs,Hn.A.G.H.(CityofLond.
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel,CaptainHerbertMerton
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
MorganDavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley,HonM.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C E.(Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William(Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles,T.Gibson(King'sLynn)
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dunn, Sir William
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hayter, Rt. Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mellor,Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George(York,W.R.)
Wilson,Chas. Henry(Hull,W.)
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Warner and Mr. Rea.

(7.33.) Question put accordingly, "That the word 'Ten' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes 153 Noes, 48. (Division List No. 608.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hon. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Henage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn, Sir William H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dunn, Sir William
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon, Richard B.
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Lough, Thomas
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.

Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir John Dickson-Poynder
and Dr. Macnamara.

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LONDON WATER (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

(9.0.) MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) called attention to the act that there were not forty Members present.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: There can be no count at the opening of the Evening Sitting before ten o'clock.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanark, Mid.): The new Rule is that there can be a count, but that the House cannot be counted out. What happens is, that if there are not forty Members present the House passes to the next business. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."]

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: According to the new Rule the House cannot be counted at the Evening Sitting before 10 o'clock; but if a division takes place before that hour and forty Members are not present the House passes to the next business.

MR. CALDWELL said he thought the Rule meant that the House could not be counted out, and unless there were forty Members present they must pass on to the next business.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I take it that "count" means count in the ordinary way.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that in moving the Amendment standing in his name he wished to say that he had no animosity whatever towards the City Council. It might be thought that he was a champion of the London County Council, but he wished to point out that he had no connection with that body in any way, and he was not addressing the Committee as their champion. When it was the fashion of those with whom he usually acted to make little of the great past of the City of London he had always readily acknowledged what they had done, not only for that one square mile in the City but for greater London and for the Empire. He did not wish to urge that the City of London should not have the fullest amount of consideration and representation on anything with which it was connected in regard to matters of this kind. The question of representation was based mainly upon the ground of ratable value and population. He wished to consider whether the City had a claim on these grounds to the representation which was now proposed to be given to it upon the Water Board. It might appear that the City, having a very great ratable value, ought to have considerable representation, but, as a matter of fact, did this question of the water supply rest in the case of the City of London upon the rateable value?

The bulk of the water which was supplied to the City of London was supplied by the New River Company. What had been the action of that company? Over and over again it had been represented in the past that the amount of water supplied to the City was not in keeping with the ratable value, and that the charges made for water were out of all proportion to the water supply. The New River Company accepted that as a fair argument upon the part of the City authorities, and they had reduced those charges because it appeared to the water company that the City should not pay for large warehouses and large buildings containing innumerable sets of offices as if they were habitations peopled like the thickly inhabited parts of London. The Water Company was aware that the water was used largely for cleansing the asphalte in the street at night, but the amount of water used in the daytime was very small, simply because those who lunched in the City did not consume a very large quantity of water. If, therefore, it was unfair to base the representation of the City on the Water Board upon ratable value, the only other basis to go upon was that of population. It would be grossly unjust to give to the City of London two members on the basis of ratable value when the water in the City was not supplied upon that basis. It would be admitted that this was not a case of giving to each individual in the City a certain proportion of water, but it was a case of providing that the service on the whole should be sufficient, that a certain standard of purity should be maintained, and that the supply should be sufficient for the purposes of public health. Otherwise the supply might be taken on the basis laid down by a certain Irish waiter who supplied a customer with oysters, the customer complaining that they were bad. The waiter replied, "You have nothing to complain about; you called for a dozen oysters and I have given you two extra."

Therefore the test in the City should be population and not ratable value. He would therefore examine the claims of the City from the standpoint of population. The night population of the City of London was 26,923. That was the population upon which to base the water supply, because the bulk of those who inhabited the City by day left in the evening and generally had only one meal in the City. Therefore the bulk of the necessity so far as water was concerned did not fall upon the area of the City, but upon the localities where those persons who were employed in the City during the day lived. How did this night population of the City compare with some of the districts which had two members of the Water Board under this proposal? Take for example the Borough of Islington, which had a night population of 334,991. That was twelve times as great as the night population of the City of London. Take the borough of Camberwell. The City of London had not one-tenth of the night population of the great borough of Camberwell, which contained 259,359. The City of London, therefore, with one-tenth of the population of Camberwell, and one-twelfth of that of Islington, was to have two representatives; in other words, six times the representation of Islington and ten times that of Camberwell. Even on the day population of 301,384 in 1891, the City had fewer inhabitants by 31,000 than Islington. Or, to put the case in another way, the City had ·43 per cent. of the population of the entire water area, and 9·7 per cent. of the ratable value, the mean of those two ratios being 5·09. The London County Council area, with ten representatives, had 72·44 per cent. of the entire population, and 80·18 per cent. of the rateable value, or a mean of 76·31. Therefore, each representative of the County Council represented a mean of 7·63 per cent., so that the City, with a mean of 5·09 per cent. had a greater representation to the extent of 2·63. He asked hon. Members to show on what basis the City, if entitled to only one representative according to ratable value and population, was given two members, and why the County Council was not given a proportionate representation. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out 'two' and insert 'one.'"—(*Captain Norton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of proposed Amendment."

*SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) said the statements that the London County Council had always been recognised as the water authority, and was the sanitary authority for the Metropolis, were both inaccurate. The sanitary authorities were the Borough Councils, and if anybody could claim, and he believed nobody could, to be the water authority for London, it certainly was the Corporation. The hon. Member opposite was obviously not aware that this water question had been a vital one with the Corporation for the last twenty-five years. Up to 1892, the Corporation was the only authority in London that could promote Bills in Parliament for gas or water undertakings, and they had been entirely in unison with the London County Council during the last few years on the subject and had received much generous and sympathetic help from that body. He believed, however, that the water question would never have been brought to its present stage but for the Corporation. Within the last twenty years the Corporation had spent, not out of rates but out of their own cash, £20,000 in endeavouring to bring this water question to a focus, with the one aim of doing what they could for the benefit, not of their own square mile only, but of the whole Metropolis. The most extraordinary thing about the hon. Member's Motion was that while he desired to eliminate a good many of the seventy-three Members of the Board, he yet was willing to hand the water supply over to the 126 members of the County Council. Then the hon. Gentleman opposite was quite wrong in his statistics. The night population of the City, according to the statistics of the London County Council, was 36,002. Then the hon. Gentleman quoted the day population at something like 300,000. It was more than double that. The hon. Gentleman would give the City representation on the night population, but would he assess the City on that basis? No, he would assess them on their £3,872,679 of rateable value. Not only was it right that the City should have the representation the Government had proposed, but it was surprising that someone had not asked that its representation should be doubled. By securing what was known as the Auction Clause and the Chamberlain of London Sinking Fund Clause, the City had done good service to Londoners generally. The City had not acted on any niggardly one-square-mile idea in its discharge of its trusts, and he was surprised that the hon. and gallant Member had made this proposal.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that in these days when there was a diminution of interest in local affairs, a dying out of public spirit, and not that attention paid to the traditions of local government that could be desired, he was prepared to forgive the right hon. Baronet for using the debates of the House of Commons to speak of the greatness and history of the City of London. The ex-Lord Mayor defended the City in and out of season, but at present it was desirable to get back to the object of the Amendment before the Committee. His hon. friend did not object to the City having two members; he would not mind it having three or four, or whatever its ratable value and population entitled it to, provided there was an equalised water rate over the whole area of supply, and the representation was on a common basis. With its high ratable value, small population, and paying on the amount of water consumed, the City, if it availed itself of Clause 15 (6), would have to pay only half the amount per thousand gallons paid by Stepney, Limehouse, Battersea, or Whitechapel. Westminster had secured a Clause enabling the present low water rate to be maintained in districts where it was possible to have a low rate. What guarantee was there that the City would not follow suit? There was no desire to impose a disability on the City by this Amendment, but simply to point out that under the Bill such an arrangement as he had described was possible. As to other remarks of the right hon. Baronet, the County Council was the chief sanitary authority for the Metropolis, the Borough Councils looking after local sanitation only, while the central body was responsible for the public health, main drainage, fire brigade, and other services. It was perfectly true that for two or three centuries the City Corporation was the only authority in London with power to initiate legislation, but they failed to exercise that power, and that was his complaint. If the City had done its duty a hundred or so years ago the House of Commons would not have had to discuss *ad nauseum* various Water Bills. What they were now contending for was an equalised water rate over the whole area on some intelligible basis; it would then be an easy matter to determine whether the City was entitled to one, two, three or four members on the Water Board.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY thought the hon. and gallant Member for West

Newington had knocked the bottom out of the contention that the constitution of the Water Board was based on proportionate grounds, whether of ratable value or of population. The right hon. Baronet urged that the day rather than the night population should be considered, but it was not people but property and hereditaments that were assessed. Evidently the ex-Lord Mayor favoured a poll-tax, a view which his constituents might do well to note. But where were the champions of Islington, Lambeth, Stepney, St. Pancras, and Wandsworth, whose interests were jeopardised by this proposal? The population of those districts was overwhelmingly greater than that of the City, and yet the right hon. Baronet stood alone in supporting the cause of his people.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) pointed out that the question of other boroughs would come up on other Amendments.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said the scheme of the Bill had been shown to be illogical in every sense, and he was surprised that members of the opposite Party did not rise in their places in the interests of their constituents.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON expressed his surprise that the right hon. gentleman had vouchsafed no reply on this matter. The Amendment was not directed against the City as such; it was moved with a view to getting information as to the basis on which the City was allowed two members on the Board. There must be some reason, as the right hon. gentleman had declared that the Bill was founded on a logical basis, and the Committee were entitled to know what that reason was. There was great danger in this differentiation between the various parts of the Metropolis. It involved artificial and arbitrary selection. If adhered to, it would enable other parts, as they increased in population or ratable value, to claim a larger share of representation, and then this Board, already too large, would become yet more cumbersome and unwieldy. Westminster had already taken care to guard itself against any equalisation of the water rate, and the Opposition desired to know whether that provision would apply to other parts, especially to the City.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the hon. Members for Battersea and North Camberwell and himself were never likely to agree as to the precise result of this Bill or as to the present incidence of rates in London. They held exactly opposite views. The hon. Member for Battersea held that the London County Council would find all the money; he, on the other hand, held that the money would be found exactly as the greater proportion of the expenditure of the London County Council was now found, viz., by precepts issued to the Metropolitan Borough Councils. Each of those districts would pay their share according to the ratable value of their own area. In making this proposal the Government had had regard to the mean of population and the ratable value. Upon this basis they had given to certain Metropolitan Boroughs two members each and they had found that the City of London judged in this way was second only to the City of Westminster in the amount of ratable value. They had also based the representation in the case of the City of London upon historical precedents and the fact that the ratable value came second as compared with all the ratable areas in London. Therefore on those grounds the Government thought the City of London was entitled to have two representatives on the Water Board.

Amendment negatived.

*(10.0.) MR. LOUGH said he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was disposed to make any concession upon the Amendment which he was about to move. This provision seemed to be an attempt to give proportionate representation to the metropolitan boroughs, but he thought he would be able to show to the Committee that there was no success in this attempt. There were other boroughs quite as large which had only one representative, and he wished to know why two members had been given to certain boroughs and only one to others. Stepney got two representatives while Camberwell, Wandsworth, and Hackney, which had a much larger area than Stepney, and each of which contained a vast population, were only to be allowed one member each. Kensington got two representatives whilst Southwark only had one. This showed that there was considerable inequality, and that the Government could not

possibly have followed any just principle in making this division of representation. Altogether there were some 3,000 representatives on the metropolitan boroughs, each of them representing a ward. The largest wards contained about 4,000 electors and the smallest between 800 and 1,000. Under this proposal they gave thirty-six representatives to the Borough Councils. Supposing they were taken from the most populous wards, the whole of these thirty-six members would only represent a population of about 144,000. If they were taken from the smallest wards they would represent between 29,000 and 36,000 electors. If the right hon. Gentleman felt himself pledged to give these Borough Councils representation, surely one would be quite enough, and by adopting this Amendment he would be doing something at the same time to reduce the size of this unwieldy Board. The President of the Local Government Board said that he had considered not only population but also rateable value. If that were so, why should Lambeth have two members and Paddington only one? There were 300,000 people in Paddington, or almost the same number as in Lambeth, and Wandsworth also had a very large ratable value. He was bound to say that he thought the right hon. Gentleman by this proposal had failed to establish any intelligible system of proportionate representation. If they now established a precedent for giving these bodies two members, in two or three years time the right hon. Gentleman would have to double the representation of other districts, and they would probably get eventually some ninety or one hundred members on the Water Board. The great objection to this proposal was that the Board would be too large and unwieldy.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, to leave out 'two,' and insert 'one.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea) said he proposed to support this Amendment for reasons which the hon. Member who moved it had not given. Some of the reasons which actuated him in taking this course might have been advanced in regard to the last Amendment upon the representation of the City. When the new Act constituting the metropolitan boroughs was passed the principle was laid down that all these metropolitan boroughs should be treated with absolute equality. Their existence was not based on any rigid figures of population or ratable value—some boroughs were created which were small both in ratable value and in population, but nevertheless they were supposed to be worthy of a new municipal life because of their history and present local life In his opinion the introduction into this Bill of a differentiation between these boroughs was a distinct departure from the real spirit of the Act which created them. Therefore he felt bound to support this Amendment, and he asked hon. Members to support him in resisting this attempt to make an artificial distinction in regard to the metropolitan boroughs. The hon. Member opposite had pointed out that the reasons given by the right hon. Gentleman for this difference of treatment in respect of the six selected boroughs were very small reasons. In all these boroughs the conditions were constantly changing, and from time to time, if they paid this regard to small differences of population, it would be necessary to re-adjust their representation on the Water Board. Surely this would be undesirable. He thought all those twenty-eight boroughs ought to have one equal representation on the new Water Board. He wished to remind the President of the Local Government Board that although they were quite prepared to accept the scheme of the Government he thought that if without affecting the essential character of the scheme they could reduce the number of representatives it would be a good thing for the future working of this Board, and in the Amendment before the Committee they had an opportunity of doing this. At the same time he must admit that Westminster was in a different position to the other boroughs, and it was so treated under the London Government Bill. The City of Westminster partook more of the ancient character which characterised the City of London, and therefore they would not be doing anything contrary to the spirit of the London Government Act by placing Westminster and the City in an exceptional position, and in allotting to them both two representatives on the Water Board.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he had listened with much pleasure to the speech of the hon. Member for Chelsea. He appealed to the Government not to differentiate on artificial grounds between the different metropolitan boroughs because this would cause irritation in a number of ways. Camberwell seemed to him to be the most hardly treated of any borough in London, and he did not know what Camberwell had done to be treated in this way. Camberwell was the birth-place of the Colonial Secretary, and he thought that fact ought to commend itself to the Government. Camberwell had a population of 258,538, and that population was growing. It also had a ratable value of £971,305. Nevertheless under this scheme Camberwell would only have one representative. Stepney, which was to have two representatives, had a population of 294,466, or 35,000 more than Camberwell, but its ratable value was £200,000 less than Camberwell. How did they square that argument? He thought that the basis of representation which was good enough for the House of Commons ought to be good enough for a Water Bill. After what had been said he was compelled to take rateable value and population into consideration, and, considering these two questions, what fair basis had the Government adopted in giving Stepney two members? He had examined this thing with the utmost impartiality. Take the case of Kensington, which was to have two members. Kensington had a population of 86,052, while Camberwell had a population of 258,538. Therefore, on the basis of population, one Kensington man according to the proposal of the Government was equal to three Camberwell men. That was not true; at any rate it was not true in the Old Kent Road. The hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich brought in a Bill last year, in which he proposed a Water Board much smaller than was now proposed. He stated not long ago that the hon. Baronet left out of his Bill the representation of the Borough Councils, but he had since discovered that he was wrong in that statement, and he desired to withdraw it. The hon. Baronet's scheme gave sixteen members to the London County Council, one to the City of London, and one to each of the Metropolitan Boroughs. Therefore he thought the hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich ought now to support this Amendment, which would operate in such a way as not to create this unjust differentiation. It would be fair and reasonable to give one representative to each of these boroughs, thereby standing by the principle of 1899.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster) stated that Westminster had a population eight times larger than that of the City of London and an assessable value nearly one and a half millions greater; therefore, if the City was to have a representation of two on the Water Board, it was only fair that Westminster should have a representation at least equal to it.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that if the Government saw their way to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend, the Opposition would be willing that Westminster should have two Members. If this course was adopted it would leave all these different Borough Councils on a footing of equality in regard to representation on this new Water Board.

Sir ROBERT MOWBRAY (Lambeth, Brixton) hoped that the Government, before assenting to the Amendment, would carefully consider what they were doing. The Boroughs had been put into the Bill and he hoped they would remain there with the right to elect two members of the Board. His constituency in Lambeth were exceedingly anxious that this double representation in their case should remain. If they were to go into the ancient history of these constituencies he thought a claim on historic grounds might be made on behalf of Lambeth, in the same manner as had been with regard to the City of London and the City of Westminster. He would put this consideration before the Committee. Of all the Metropolitan Boroughs, Lambeth was second in point of population and fifth as regards ratable value. By reducing the number of the Board to 33 they might get a more workable Board, but it would have lost its representative character. A mere reduction of numbers from 73 to 68 or 69 would be of no practical value in making the Board more workable, but it would reduce the interest taken in it by the Metropolitan Boroughs. He hoped the President of the Local Government Board would not accept the Amendment.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said he could not support any proposal which would make any inroad on the scheme produced by the Government, but this Amendment would not make an inroad upon it. He thought it would improve the scheme to slightly reduce the number of members of the Board. After all it should be remembered that the object ought to be to get the best men on the Water Board. Each of the boroughs might be able to get one good man, but if they had to select two good men he thought there would be a practical difficulty in getting a second as good as the first. He thought the City of Westminster should have two members on account of its special position.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets) said he did not agree with all the figures which had been given by the hon. Member for North Camberwell. Speaking for the Borough Council of Stepney, he could not believe that they would be so unreasonable as to wish, for the sake of a difference represented by a few hundred pounds, that they should have two members while Camberwell had only one. He did not agree with the proposal in regard to Westminster, and he hoped the Government would not except that city.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE said he was decidedly of opinion that it was a bad thing to make a difference in the representation of these boroughs. Except with regard to Westminster, he thought it was a pity to differentiate the representation. He trusted the Government would accept the proposal.

MR. COHEN stated that he objected to the proposal to reduce the representation of Islington. On the ground of population and ratable value, that district was entitled to the representation proposed by the Government, and he hoped they would adhere to their original plan in regard to Islington. If the London County Council was equitably represented by ten members and Islington by two, how was that equity preserved if they took away one member from Islington and allowed the County Council ten to remain? Equity and justice required that Islington should have two representatives.

MR. WALTER LONG stated that the Government had selected these particular boroughs in consideration of their population and ratable value. The Government felt that there was so much difference in regard to the population and rateable value in the case of some of the metropolitan boroughs that they ought to be given a larger share of representation. Of course he fully admitted that there were some boroughs which came very near the line, and he was glad that the representatives of boroughs to which additional representation had been given had given way. He could not help thinking it would be fairer all round that the boroughs should have equal representation, and would avoid a difficulty which he confessed had not occurred to him—namely, that, however accurate the calculations of the Government might be now, the time must come before very long when they might be entirely upset. In these circumstances he hoped the larger boroughs would feel that it was to the advantage of the whole that they should concede this.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made—

"In line 4, by leaving out the words, 'two by the council of each of the metropolitan boroughs of Islington, Kensington, Lambeth, St. Pancras, Stepney, and Westminster,' and inserting the words, 'one by the council of each of the metropolitan boroughs.'"—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

(10.45) MR. SYDNEY BUXTON moved an Amendment with the object of grouping the metropolitan boroughs for the purposes of representation, and so reducing their total number on the Board. The object of the President of the Local

Government Board in having the metropolitan boroughs represented would still be gained, although, by the system of grouping which he suggested, the number of representatives would be reduced from thirty-four to twelve. By his Amendment a considerable number of the boroughs would be grouped, but there was nothing in it which would affect the principle of the proposal of the Government. He did not desire to discuss further the question of the excessive size of the board. He thought it was generally admitted that it would be an advantage to reduce the size of the body. It was on these grounds that he desired to press his Amendment on the right hon. Gentleman. He did not cling to the exact number he had proposed, but threw it out more as a suggestion. If the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to accept the principle of his Amendment, he would not press as to details. If the right hon. Gentleman showed a conciliatory spirit in this matter he would do much to make the passage of the Bill easy.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 6, to leave out the words 'council of each of the other metropolitan boroughs,' and insert the words 'councils of the metropolitan boroughs of Poplar and Stepney; one by the councils of the metropolitan boroughs of Bethnal Green, Hackney, and Stoke Newington.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. WALTER LONG said he thought he had shown the Committee that the Government were desirous of meeting any reasonable proposal which had for its object the more equitable distribution of the representation. But it would be impossible for the Government to accept the hon. Gentleman's suggestion, even in a limited form. In the first place, they thought that each of the metropolitan boroughs was entitled to separate representation on the new Board. Apart from that, if the hon. Gentleman's suggestion were accepted it would seriously disturb the balance of power as between London within and London without.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that if his Amendment were carried, it would also carry with it a considerable reduction in the representation of the outer areas.

MR. WALTER LONG said that if they were practically to reduce at the same time the representation given to the outside areas, the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar would not be open to the criticism he had been making upon it. He could assure the Committee that from the first, when it was represented to him that one of the flaws in their proposal was the largeness of the number of the new governing body, he had endeavoured to meet that criticism. He thought the best plan to do that was to maintain a proper balance of representation between London Within and London Without. If they were to strike out a number of representatives from London Within, it would involve the re-casting of the representation of London Without, and thus destroy the whole character of the Bill. While he was most desirous of meeting in a conciliatory and reasonable spirit any suggestion, he felt that the Government had gone as far as they could, and that they could not accept the hon. Gentleman's suggestion, either in whole or in part.

*MR. REA (Gloucester) said he supported the Amendment for the simple reason that it would reduce the number of the Board from seventy-five to forty-seven, a number approaching very nearly to that of the old Metropolitan Board of Works. That body had few friends, and he was not one of them, but he considered it was a more practical and reasonable administrative body than that proposed for the Water Board. The Metropolitan Board of Works had far more duties to perform than the Water Board would have. At the beginning they had only to take care of the main drainage, but shortly afterwards Parliament added to their powers the care of the main thoroughfares, the improvement of new streets, and the charge of commons, open spaces, and the fire brigade. It had never been said that the Metropolitan Board of Works was under-manned. The Board of Works was a superior body to the proposed Water Board in another respect. Although its elections were indirect they were more direct than those of the proposed Water Board. In the case of the latter, the electors elected the local authority, the local authority met together and elected a committee, and the committee elected one member of the Board. But that was not the end of it. When they were elected they elected members to the Thames Conservancy, and then the Thames Conservancy elected members back to the Board.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that the Committee were not now discussing the Board of Works, and the hon. Gentleman was not in order.

*MR. REA said he was only alluding to the Board of Works as an illustration, and he would pass from it at once. He remembered a speech made in Committee before the recess, by the hon. Member for Exeter, in which that Gentleman admitted that if he were to judge from the point of view of efficiency, he would have a small Board, but he justified the Government proposal on the ground of representation. Surely it was not beyond the wit of man to frame a Board which would be both efficient and representative. The number of directors of the water companies, excluding those of the New River Company, which was a mediæval concern, put together amounted to sixty-one. He should like to ask any water Director, if he wished to make a commercial combine of the water companies, would he suggest that all the Boards should be amalgamated too, and that the directors should continue to draw their fees?

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Gentleman's remarks were not relevant to the Amendment before the Committee.

*MR. REA said he supported the Amendment because it would reduce the number of members on the Board.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that that was a general question which had been decided on the first Amendment.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that the whole reason of his Amendment was that it would reduce the numbers of the Board.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said that the Amendment before the Committee was to leave out the words on the Paper and insert another word.

*MR. REA submitted that the effect of the Amendment before the Committee would be to reduce the number of Members of the Water Board by no less than eighteen. In the great provincial towns, although the committees are often large, the real business of the Water Committee was done by two or three members, and what the other members were most interested in were the sources of supply and the fishing. The metropolitan water companies had not the possession of any effective fishing at the present time. Why bring in the metropolitan boroughs, because after all these were not real boroughs. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] They were metropolitan boroughs, but they differed from real boroughs in that, although they had a Mayor and Town Council, they had not even the powers of Urban District Councils. The Urban District Councils which would be represented on the Water Board had control of the fire brigade, open spaces, and building regulations, whereas all these duties in the metropolitan area were performed by the London County Council.

CAPTAIN JESSEL asked if the hon. Gentleman was in order in calling attention to the powers and duties of the metropolitan boroughs.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Gentleman was not entitled to go into these questions except as an illustration of his argument.

*MR. REA said that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board declared that everybody approved of the constitution of the new Water Board except the London County Council, and that the London boroughs did approve of it. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to intimate that the London boroughs represented the citizens, while the London County Council only represented the members of the London County Council. Why, the London County Council was elected on this very issue. The metropolitan boroughs were consulted by the Government and were offered this representation, and naturally the members had not declined it. As to the London Members of Parliament they knew that they were not elected on this question but on something very different. It appeared to him that instead of everybody agreeing with this Bill except the London County Council, all the experts, the Royal Commission, the Committees of this House, and all public opinion condemned the Bill.

*MR. LOUGH said that whether they accepted the precise Amendment before the Committee or not, the Government ought to give this matter more serious consideration before this Clause was passed. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill said that the main principle on which he had proceeded in allotting members to the new Board was ratable value; but when thirty-two members were allotted to the Borough Councils that was far beyond the proportion they were entitled to on ratable value. The right hon. Gentleman had also taken the population into account; but if the Amendment was not accepted there would be many anomalies. Boroughs with a population of 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000 received one member, while other boroughs with a population of from 200,000 to 300,000 received only one member also. Would not the right hon. Gentleman be willing to reduce the number of representatives of the Borough Councils, if not to ten, at least to fifteen or sixteen? His argument was that the right hon. Gentleman could secure the whole principle of the Bill by accepting some reduction.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had already stated that if the Government were to reduce the number of representatives given to the Metropolitan Boroughs they should have to reduce the proportion of representatives of London Without. He had already grouped as far as possible the outer districts, and had given a minimum representation to the metropolitan boroughs. If they were to take 15 or 20 from the representatives of the metropolitan boroughs, the representation of London would become unfair. Of course, the hon. Gentleman was quite right in saying that there were many anomalies in regard to the representation of the different boroughs. The only way to avoid that would be to carve London into new districts, but everybody would admit that it was best to take the existing areas which had their own local life.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that everyone could see the force of what the right hon. Gentleman had said with regard to the necessity of maintaining a proper proportion between inner London and outer London. But he did not understand that his hon. friend wished to alter materially the proportion fixed in the Bill. They proceeded on the original question as to whether a Board so constituted would not be unwieldy, cumbrous, and ineffective; and in that opinion they were supported by all the authorities who had investigated the question. What was the use of appointing Royal Commission after Royal Commission if no attention was to be paid to what they said. The one thing on which all the Commissions were agreed was that the governing body should be much smaller than that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. If he might be permitted to say so, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to him to assume rather a helpless attitude, in which he should have thought he would not allow himself to remain. The right hon. Gentleman said, "What am I to do? The body may be cumbrous, and I would be quite content to see the number of the representatives of the metropolitan boroughs reduced, but we cannot do that, because we must have representatives from certain districts outside London, and they are so numerous that we must have a sufficient number of representatives of inner London to maintain the balance." He should have thought that the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman would have overcome that difficulty, and certainly he thought the obvious and acknowledged evil of such a huge, cumbrous Board would outweigh any little difficulty of that kind. There might be a county basis, or some other arrangement. His hon. friend was not particularly tied to the grouping he indicated in the Amendment, but what he proposed was that there should be a governing body of thirty-six members, twenty-four from London and twelve from outside. The Committee ought to bear in mind the importance of an effective and business-like body, rather than the desire to please this locality or that locality, and to satisfy its requirements, and, in some respects, its pride. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to accept the Amendment.

MR. BOUSFIELD asked if it would be worth while to spoil the symmetry of the scheme in order to save seven representatives. London had been divided up into different units, and they wished to make them separate and corporate units in reality, and to treat them all on the same basis, with the exception of special areas.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said that, as a very large ratepayer in one of the outlying districts, he knew how the rates would be affected. The importance of a small and effective body was so great that he was quite sure the outlying districts would be willing to sacrifice some off their representation in order to secure it, with a view to mitigating the enormous rates now paid in the suburbs. The amalgamation of boroughs inside London would be a great help, and it would reduce the representation to a manageable size. He thought the outlying districts, if they had a chance, would say that they desired the Amendment to pass, even with the condition that their representation should be reduced, and he was quite sure it would be a benefit, not only as regarded the reduction of rates, but also as regarded the working of the Bill as a whole. There would be much less friction, as, the larger the constituency, the less likely would it be that its representatives would have special local interests to serve, instead of fighting for a pure and sufficient supply of water and a reduction of rates. He hoped the Government would yet make the concession asked for, and reduce the representation both in inner and outer London.

Mr. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) said he would point out that, even according to hon. Members on the Opposition side, the outside areas were growing areas, and, in these circumstances, he thought the Amendment was unsound.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said the proportion would remain unaltered as the outer representation would also be reduced.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT said the hon. Gentleman opposite, said the Amendment would spoil the symmetry of the scheme; but surely there should be grouping in inside London as well as in outside London. Many of the Urban District Councils mentioned in the Bill were just as important as some of the Borough Councils. Personally, he felt great difficulty in voting, because he objected to the system of grouping, which was not a representative system at all. It was popular control three degrees removed; but on the principle that the smaller the body for administrative purposes the better he would support the Amendment.

(11.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 130; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 609)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cremer, William Randal
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Helme, Norval Watson
Lough, Thomas
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tully, Jasper
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Causton and Mr. Spencer.

MR. BOUSFIELD said he wished to move in line eight to omit "two" and insert "one." The principle had been accepted that the metropolitan boroughs should be treated as units without regard to size; and therefore it seemed to him that the borough of West Ham should not be given two representatives. He thought it would give rise to great jealousy, especially in the important boroughs which had agreed to their representation being reduced. Why should West Ham have two representatives, when Islington, which was one of the largest boroughs in London, had only one?

Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment—

"In line 8, to leave out 'two' and insert 'one.'"—(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said he ventured to hope that the Government would not accede to the Amendment. It was perfectly true that the representation of some of the metropolitan boroughs had been cut down; but there was an immense difference between the metropolitan boroughs and the county borough of West Ham. Not only had the metropolitan boroughs direct representation on the Water Board, but they were also represented through the County Council. West Ham, however, had no hand whatever in the election of the London County Council, and would not be represented by it nor by the Essex County Council on the Water Board. Therefore, it was not on all fours with the metropolitan boroughs. He would further point out that the councils of the various urban districts had agreed to the scheme in the Bill, and now relied on the good faith of the Government. He said with all possible respect that if the Government broke faith and accepted an Amendment such as that before the committee the influence of the action in West Ham would be that they would use their utmost efforts to oppose the Bill at every stage. They had the greatest difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory scheme, but having obtained one it should not now be heedlessly destroyed. It should further be remembered that the greatest earning power existed in the outside areas.

MR. BOUSFIELD said he did not understand that there was any question of an arrangement; and as the matter required greater consideration, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) moved to leave out "one" in line nine, and insert "two by the councils or urban districts of East Ham, Barking, and Ilford." The President of the Board of Trade had said that outside areas had the minimum representation, and this especially applied to the districts mentioned in the Amendment. Further, the hon. Member for North-West Ham pointed out that the greatest earning power existed in the outside areas; and inasmuch as the Water Board was going to take a well in Barking for the use of other districts, the least that district might receive was representation on the Board. East Ham had a population of nearly 100,000, and Barking had a population of over 40,000; and it was apparent that a Bill of this kind would operate adversely on such districts unless they had proper and adequate representation on the Board. He would be very grateful to the President of the Local Government Board if the districts mentioned in the Amendment would be given representation on the Board. They would be affected by the Bill, and should not be excluded from representation.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 9, to leave out 'one' and insert 'two' by the councils or urban districts of East Ham, Barking and Ilford.'"—(*Mr. Louis Sinclair.*)

MR. WALTER LONG said he wished to point out to the hon. Member that only a very small portion of Barking was supplied at present, and that there was a provision in the Bill, if the circumstances which now existed were altered, giving the Local Government Board power to alter the conditions of the representation. The other districts were provided for in the Bill; and therefore he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. LOUGH moved to leave out lines 9 to 13, and insert "One by the councils of the urban districts of Buckhurst Hill, Chingford, East Ham, Leyton, Loughton, Waltham Holy Cross, Wanstead, and Woodford." The object of the Amendment was to reduce the representation of the county of Essex. The right hon. Gentleman stated that a balance had been established between inner London and outer London; but he wished to point out that the representation of inner London had been altered, and therefore it would be a great injustice if the representation of outer London was not also altered. In the original scheme inner London had forty-six members and outer London twenty-one. That meant that a reduction of five in London within necessitated a reduction of three in London without, and if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the counties where a reduction was possible he would find that Essex was the county in which it was most desirable to make a change. The representation of the various counties was most unequal. The county of London had one representative for every 99,000 inhabitants, Middlesex one for every 81,000, and Essex one for every 56,000. Therefore, Essex had a larger representation than it was entitled to. If ratable value were considered, the difference was equally astounding. The five members given to Essex represented a ratable value of £886,000 with a population of 234,000. Islington, with a population of 340,000 and a ratable value of £1,500,000, had only one representative. He thought such inequality ought to be removed. The idea of giving five members to such a county, was, if he might be permitted to say so, quite absurd. The Amendment proposed only one representative; but if the right hon. Gentleman would be content with two, he would be prepared to accept it. He would urge the right hon. Gentleman to look at the matter in a liberal spirit. If the right hon. Gentleman did not wish to agree to the precise words of the Amendment, perhaps he would consider the matter, and bring up a Clause at a later stage.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out lines 9 to 13, and insert —'One by the councils of the urban districts of Buckhurst Hill, Chingford, East Ham, Leyton, Loughton, Waltham Holy Cross, Wanstead and Woodford.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. WALTER LONG said the Amendment would reverse the effect of the Amendments which had been already adopted. It would be just as inequitable in one direction as the operation of the previous Amendment would be in the opposite direction. The Amendment before the Committee would reduce the representation of the outside areas, and would, therefore, make the predominance of London greater than it was, or than it ought to be. The hon. Member pointed out that there was no very consistent plan for the distribution of representation in the Bill; but his answer to that was, as he had stated over and over again, that they should take England as they found it and not cut it up into new areas merely to suit new requirements. It was perfectly true that the unit of representation was less in some districts than in others; but so far as they could they had endeavoured to secure an equitable representation for all the parts represented. He did not in any way wish to suggest that the subject was not one of considerable importance, but he would venture respectfully to point out that the Amendment was merely ringing the changes on the original proposal. They had considered almost every possible alteration, and he would only add that he strongly felt that unless they stood by some recognised principle of representation which would maintain the balance of power between London within and London without, they would disturb that balance, and have the various authorities claiming to have the whole question reconsidered.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that inner London only had a representation of 64½ per cent., whereas, on the basis of population and rateable value, it ought to have a representation of 81 per cent. It was therefore clear that inner London was under represented. He did not see why the outer areas should be over represented, especially as under the Bill if the population increased to a certain point in any particular area that area would be entitled to further representation. That would safeguard the interests of the outer districts, and the Board should be put on the proper basis of representation and rateable value. The Amendment would make the proportion as between inner and outer London better; and therefore he would support it.

MR. BOUSFIELD said he would ask the President of the Local Government Board to consider before the Report stage whether he could not, by a little different grouping, make a reduction in the representation of the outside areas which would be proportionate to that made in the inside areas.

MR. WALTER LONG said the matter had been very seriously considered more than once, but he should be glad to consider what would be the precise effect of the changes which had been made in the representation of inner London, and whether it called for any alteration of the kind indicated.

MR. CORRIE GRANT said he would suggest that Progress should now be reported, in order that the Committee might have an opportunity of considering the matter.

MR. WALTER LONG said if his undertaking to consider the matter was met by a Motion to report Progress, he certainly would withdraw it.

MR. LOUGH said that the question which had been put to the right hon. Gentleman was, would he undertake to reduce the representation? [HON. MEMBERS: To consider the reduction].

MR. WALTER LONG said he was willing to consider it.

MR. LOUGH asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee reported Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill is originated in the Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Lord Ashbourne*	Read 2^a 24th Nov. (222)
*Consolidated Fund (No.2)		Royal Assent (373)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Duke of Devonshire*	Read 1^a 3rd Dec. (1049) Second Reading 4th Dec. (1190)
*Expiring Laws Continuance		Read 1^a 3rd Dec. (1049)
*Patent Law Amendment		Committee 20th Nov. (3) Report 24th Nov. (226) Read 3^a and passed 1st Dec. (813)
*Supreme Court of Judicature [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Consideration of Commons Amendments 20th Nov. (3) Royal Assent 25th Nov. (370)

(B.) House of Commons.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) (No. 2)	*Mr. Ritchie*	Royal Assent (370)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Mr. A. J. Balfour*	Committee 20th Nov. (31) (97) Report 25th Nov. (387) (449) ,, 26th ,, (515) (573) ,, 27th ,, (634) (700) ,, 28th ,, (749) 3rd Reading 2nd Dec. (926) (1003) Read 3^o and passed 3rd Dec. (1067) (1142)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Expiring Laws Continuance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Read 3° and passed 1st Dec. (905) Royal Assent 25th Nov. (373)
*Fisheries (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 1st Dec. (906)
Ice Cream shops (Scotland)	*Mr. Orr-Ewing.*	Bill withdrawn 20th Nov. (31)
*Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 1st Dec. (905)
*Local Government (Scotland) Amendment (No. 2)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Bill withdrawn 1st Dec. (905)
*Local Government (Transfer of Powers)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 1st Dec. (906)
*London Water	*Mr. Walter Long*	Committee 4th Dec. (1333) (1391)
*Mail Ships	*Sir. Robt. Finlay*	Second Reading 1st. Dec (906)
*Osborne Estate	*Mr. Ritchie*	Read 2° 21st Nov. (198)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1902.

List of Rules, Orders, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, (Ireland) 1877,—Copies of two Orders in Council, dated 17th November 1902, giving effect to the Rules of Court [40 and 41 Vic., c. 57, s. 69.]	20 November	100 sitting days
Public Records (War Office),—Copy of Seventh Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents existing or accruing in the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the War Department, which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	24 November	4 weeks
New South Wales (Women's Franchise Act, 1902),—Copy of the Women's Franchise Act, 1902 (New South Wales) [13 and 14 Vic., c. 59, s. 32.]	26 November	30 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FIFTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1902.

NOVEMBER 20—*DECEMBER* 4.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENTS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in the Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeenshire

Aboyne Post Office—Compulsory retirement of Miss Moggach from Office of Postmistress, Question of Pension.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 745.

Spirits, Stock in Bond March 31st, 1901 — Total Spirits Bonded and cleared from Bond from March, 1901 to March 1902—Return Ordered, *Dec. 4*, 1302.

Aboyne

Moggach, Miss, Postmistress of Aboyne—Compulsory Retirement, Question of Pension.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 745.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]

United Irish League Meeting at Glenville, Police interference with, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1313.

Accidents

Railway Accidents, *see* Railways.

Acland-Hood, Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury* (Somerset, Wellington)

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 907.

Acts of Parliament

Crown affected by an Act of Parliament only in the case of an Act specially made to apply to the Crown.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21*, 205.

Adjournment of the House

Date of termination of Session.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 386.

Procedure, New Rules—Disorder in the House, Power of Speaker to adjourn House or suspend Sitting.
Observations on Motion to convert Sessional into Standing Orders Dec. 1, 858, 883, 885, 888, 891, 893, 894, 896.

Admiralty

First Lord—Earl Selborne.

Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster,

Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Afghanistan

Russia and Afghanistan.

Commercial Relations between — Direct Communication between Russian Government and the Amir, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 845.

Russian Commercial Representative at the Court of the Amir, Rumours as to.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 163.

Situation in, Pretensions of Mahomed Omar Khan, etc.—Official Information.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 844.

Africa, East

British East Africa—Issue of Government Paper Currency proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 16 ; *Nov. 24*, 243.

Somaliland, Operations against the Mad Mullah—Names of Battalions of King's African Rifles ordered for Service.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 244.

Uganda—Currency, Issue of Government Paper Currency, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 16 ; *Nov. 24*, 243.

Africa, South

Blockhouses erected during the War, Cost of, Sale by Tender, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1317.

Boer Generals' Appeal to the Civilised World—Correspondence relating to Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1, 4.

Botha, Rev. J. F.—Efforts to promote Peace, Public apology for action.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 239.

British Troops in
Canteen at Pretoria—Regulations as to Contracts.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 919.

Customs Duties — Exemption of Articles for use of the British Troops, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 916.

Families of Soldiers detained in South Africa, sending out, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 378.

Inniskilling Fusiliers, First Battalion —Date of return from South Africa.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 616.

Natal—Permanent Military Headquarters.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 843.

Number of.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 843.

Pay, Total Amount per diem.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1316.

Soldiers discharged in South Africa—Inducements to settle in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 500.

Compensation given to Rebels, alleged—Unfair Treatment of Loyalists, etc.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 239.

Concentration Camps — Expenditure of Foreign Contributions.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 149.

Customs Duties—Exemption of Articles for use of the British Troops, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 916.

Education—Provisions made for Elementary Education, Religious Instruction, etc.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1053.

Loyalists, Treatment of—Persecution by Boycotting, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 239.

Africa, South—*cont.*

Martial Law
Commission — Date of presenting Report to the House.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 12.

Notices advertised in *Het Oosten*, Delay in payment of Account.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 149.

Sentences passed under—Report of Commission of Inquiry Presented, *Nov. 27*, 609 ; *Nov. 28*, 741.

Natal Military Headquarters, Permanent Establishment of.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 843.

Parcels Post, Reduction in Rates, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 914.

Permit Regulations.
Oath of Allegiance, etc.—Case of M. du Toit.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 233.

Persons entering Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Regulations as to.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1316.

Press Censorship—Removal of restrictions on Letters and Cablegrams.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 238.

Repatriation Commissions, Number appointed, Constitution of, etc.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 915, 916.

Trade Marks.—Fees for Registration.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1306.

Transvaal, *see* that title.

Volk, Mr., Minister of Dutch Reformed Church—Deprivation of Living for loyalty to the Crown and the Government of Cape Colony during the War.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 239.

Africa, West

Jubaland Military Expedition of 1901, Batta for Indian Troops.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 838.

Kroo Boys sjamboked overboard on the "Olenda" off the Liberian Coast, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 5.

Nigeria, *see* that title.

Agricultural Labourers, Ireland

Migration of—Statistics with Report for 1902, Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741, 742.

Agriculture

Bounties on Agricultural Products given by Foreign Countries and British Colonies.—Return proposed.
Qs. *Dec. 2*, 913 ; *Dec. 4*, 1307.

Parcels Post for Agricultural Products, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1326.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland

Constitution of, Changes in, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 250.

Minutes sanctioning Forms of Instruction for certain Boroughs, Counties, and Urban Districts — Copy Presented, *Nov. 27* 609 ; *Nov. 28*, 741.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*

Scientific Adviser in the Fisheries Branch, Special Qualifications necessary—Treasury Minutes Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1301.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill

l. 2R., *Nov. 24*, 222.
Com. and Report,* *Dec. 4*, 1190.

Aliens

Immigration of Pauper Aliens adding to the large number of Unemployed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 622.

Allan, Sir W. [Gateshead]

Navy.

"Canopus," H.M.S.—Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron, State of Boilers, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1321.

Cruisers of the "County" Class, Heavier Armaments, alleged lack of stability of Cruisers, *Nov. 20*, 14.

Engineer Artificers—Cabin Accommodation, *Dec. 4*, 1319.

"Good Hope," H.M.S.—Space between Decks, Insufficiency of, alleged, *Nov. 24*, 243.

Mediterranean Squadron — Engineer Officers of rank of Inspector of Machinery, Relative rank of Captain, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1318.

"Medusa," H.M.S.—Dürr Boilers' Results of Trials, Total amount spent on the Vessel, *Nov. 20*, 15.

Transport Service to South Africa—Names, Tonnage, etc., of vessels employed, Number of vessels fitted with Water-tube Boilers—Date of issue of Return, *Nov. 27*, 620.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 26*, 543.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Position of Schools transferred by a Denomination to a School Board, *Nov. 27*, 631.

Amendments

Manuscript Amendments without Notice, Limitation of practice, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 27*, 633; *Dec. 1*, 855.

Ammunition

Navy, *see* that title.

Small Arms Ammunition—Weekly Output at Woolwich Arsenal.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 499.

Animals

Cattle and Live Stock—*see* that title.

Cruelty to Animals—Case of J. Younger, Further Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 375.

Diseases of Animals—*see* that title.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University]

Architect to the Education Department—Outside and Private work, permission to undertake, *Nov. 20*, 20.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 20*, 47, 68, 71, 90, 98, 108, 117, 121; *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 390, 391, 453, 489; *Nov. 26*, 534, 568, 571, 592, 596, 604, 605; *Nov. 27*, 634, 635, 645, 648; *Nov. 28*, 755, 776, 779, 783, 790, 791, 792, 793; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 1011, 1027, 1028, 1031, 1032.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Amendments without Notice, Objections to, *Nov. 27*, 633.

Governors of Secondary Schools—Powers of Local Authorities to appoint, *Dec. 1*, 847.

Grants to Voluntary Schools earned but not paid previous to taking over by the Local Authority, *Nov. 20*, 20.

Voluntary School Teachers—Compensation to Teachers not engaged by Local Authorities, *Dec. 1*, 847.

Fees charged in Elementary Schools—Return showing Schools in which Fees are charged, Number of Scholars, and Amount of Fees, etc., proposed, *Dec. 1*, 848.

Llangollen National Schools—Children interrogated as to Religious Belief of Parents, Treatment of Children of Nonconformists, *Nov. 25*, 383.

Ardglass

Labourers' Cottages—Delay in Erection.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1329.

Argentina

Barnett, Mr. W., Murder of—Steps taken to secure punishment of Murderers.
Qs. *Nov. 24*, 243; *Dec. 3*, 1056.

Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for Slaughter—Progress of Negotiations with the Argentine Government.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 11, 19; *Nov. 27*, 623.

Armagh

Post Office Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 923.

Army

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.

Under Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.

Financial Secretary—Lord Stanley.

Africa, South, British Troops in, *see* Africa, South.

Army Corps—Effective Strength of First, Second and Third Army Corps.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 379.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Artillery—
Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers—Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy.
Q. Nov. 27, 619.
Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels, Status of.
Q. Nov. 24, 237.
Target Practice Seawards, Accommodation on Portguard and Coastguard Ships—Number of Officers taking advantage of.
Q. Nov. 20, 6.
Bread Contract at Belfast Barracks given to firm of Druggists and Chemists.
Qs. Nov. 27, 629; *Dec. 2*, 918.
Canteens—Pretoria Field Force Canteen, Regulations as to Contracts.
Q. Dec. 2, 919.
Civil Surgeons and the South African War Gratuity—Non-participation of Surgeons employed at home, Terms of Agreement, etc.
Qs. Nov. 27, 618; *Dec. 1*, 843.
Contracts—Belfast Barracks Bread Contract given to firm of Druggists and Chemists.
Qs. Nov. 27, 629; *Dec. 2*, 918.
Discipline.
Press and Parliament, Interference of, in Matters of Discipline, Protest.
Os. Lord C. Beresford, *Nov. 21*, 183, 185; Lord G. Hamilton, 189.
Writing direct to the Secretary—Case of Sergeant Leonard, Public Inquiry proposed.
Qs. Nov. 26, 501; *Dec. 4*, 1317.
Examination Text Books, Difficulty of obtaining.
Q. Nov. 20, 13.
Families of Soldiers detained in South Africa—Sending Families to South Africa, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 378.
Gratuities.
Extra War Gratuity.
Civil and Veterinary Surgeons employed at home, Non-participation in—Terms of Agreement, etc.
Qs. Nov. 27, 618; *Dec. 1*, 843.
Exclusion of Officers from participation.
Q. Nov. 27, 617.
Reserve Officers—Eligibility for benefits under Paragraph 601*a* of the Royal Warrant, Deduction on Income derived from Gratuities.
Q. Nov. 27, 615.
India, *see* that title.
Inniskilling Fusiliers, First Battalion—Date of return from South Africa.
Q. Nov. 27, 616.
Lancers, 9th, *see* India—Army.

Army—*cont.*
Leave—Annual Leave and Free Passes Home for Men on Active Service, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 498.
Medals—*see* that title.
Militia—*see* that title.
Officers.
Allowance to Officers serving in South Africa, increase in, proposed.
Q. Nov. 27, 619.
Income Tax, Exemption of Officers serving abroad, proposed.
Q. Nov. 27, 617.
Reserve Officers' Gratuities — Eligibility under paragraph 601*a* of the Royal Warrant, Deductions on Income derived from Gratuities.
Q. Nov. 27, 615.
South African War.
Gratuity—Exclusion of Officers.
Q. Nov. 27, 617.
Number of Officers mentioned in despatches who served with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments.
Q. Nov. 27, 617.
Uniform, Alterations in—Cost to Officers of constant alterations.
Q. Nov. 24, 241.
Pensions.
Indian Military Pensions—Payment of in England, proposed.
Q. Dec. 3, 1050.
Payment Weekly instead of Quarterly proposed.
Q. Nov. 28, 749.
Reserve.
Officers' Gratuities—Eligibility for benefits under Paragraph 601*a* of the Royal Warrant, Deductions on Income derived from Gratuities, etc.
Q. Nov. 27, 615.
Strength of—Effect of new Proposals for re-engagement of time-expired men.
Q. Dec. 4, 1317.
Reservists in Canterbury Workhouse—Exemption from Stone-breaking, proposed
Q. Dec. 4, 1311.
Sandhurst Military College—Cadets Messing Allowances, Extra Charges, Insufficiency of Food, etc., alleged.
Q. Dec. 2, 917.
Soldiers, *see* that title.
South African War, *see* that title.
Strength of the Regular Army at Home.
Q. Dec. 3, 1056.
Tattoo and Roll Calls, Abolition of—Army Order of September.
Q. Nov. 26, 502.
Uniforms, alterations in—Cost to Officers of constant alteration.
Q. Nov. 24, 241.
Veterinary Surgeons employed in the South African War.
Employment of Surgeons not members of the R.C.V.S.
Q. Nov. 20, 11.

cont.

Army—*cont.*
  Veterinary Surgeons—*cont.*
    Gratuity—Non-participation of Surgeons employed at home, Terms of agreement, etc.
      Q. *Nov. 27*, 618.
  Volunteers, *see* that title.
  Woolwich Arsenal, *see* that title.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Belfast, N.]
  Ammunition.
    Amount of Practice Ammunition allowed for Heavy Guns, *Nov. 25*, 380.
    Value of Defective and Dangerous Ammunition thrown overboard, *Nov. 24*, 242.
  Cadets—Messing, Cost of, Number and character of Meals provided, *Dec. 4*, 1318.
  "Canopus," H.M.S.—Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron, state of Boilers, etc., *Dec 4*, 1320, 1321.
  China Squadron.
    Coal from British North Borneo, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 502.
    Seymour Challenge Cup for good shooting, Position of Ship holding at Parades on shore, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1322.
  Cruisers.
    Armament of.
      Cruisers of the "County" type, Heavier Armaments, alleged lack of stability of Cruisers, *Nov. 20*, 14, 15.
      Guns for Cruisers of 13,500 tons displacement, Type of, *Nov. 20*, 15.
    "County" Class, Alterations in Design, *Dec. 4*, 1320.
  Engineer Artificers, Cabin Accommodation, *Dec 4*, 1329.
  "Good Hope," H.M.S.
    Boarding Pikes, Issue of, *Nov. 20*, 16.
    Space between Decks, insufficiency of, alleged, *Nov. 24*, 243.
  Irish Lights—Inaccuracy of descriptions in Admiralty List, Revision and Correction of Lists, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 620, 621.
  Mediterranean Squadron—Engineer Officers of Rank of Inspectors of Machinery, Relative rank of Captain proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1319.
  "Medusa," H.M.S.—Dürr Boilers, Results of Trials, Total Amount spent on the Vessel, *Nov. 20*, 15.
  Rations—Date of introduction of New System, *Nov. 20*, 15.
  Transport Service to South Africa—Names, Tonnage, etc., of Vessels employed, Date of issue of Return, *Nov. 27*, 620.

Artillery
  see Army.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E].
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 27*, 665, 666; 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1160.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [London, N.W.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1139, 1142.
  London Water Bill, *com.* Dec. 4, 1386.

Athy
  Jurors List—Complaints as to method of preparation.
    Q. *Dec. 2*, 924.
  Publican prosecuted by the Police for serving a drunken Man—Case of Mr. P. Knowles.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 23.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
  Athy Publican prosecuted by the Police for serving a drunken man—Case of Mr. P. Knowles, *Nov. 20*, 24.
  Bagnalstown—Petty Sessions Summonses, Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the Suit of the Town Commissioners, *Nov. 27*, 626.
  Banbridge—Petty Sessions, Prosecution of Campbell and Leavy by Board of Guardians, Failure to convict, *Nov. 27*, 626.
  Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 1*, 908.
  Irish Language and Solicitors' Examinations—Refusal of Incorporated Law Society to make Irish an optional subject, *Nov. 26*, 509.

Atlantic Shipping Trade
  Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy—Government Agreement, Date of submitting to the House.
    Q. *Nov. 26*, 513.

Attorney-General
  Rt. Hon. Sir R. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Australasia
  Mail Service—Delays caused by Detention of Mails at New York.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1304.
  New South Wales Women's Franchise Act—Copy Presented, *Nov. 26*, 493.
  Sugar Bounties, Rates of.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1306.

Austria
  Sugar Bounty paid by, Amount of.
    O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 259.

Autumn Sittings of the House
  Private Members' Rights, Business which may properly be taken, etc.
    Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Dec. 1*, 857; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 872.

Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers
  Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy. *Q. Nov. 27*, 619.

Bagnalstown
  Petty Sessions Summonses—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the Suit of the Town Commissioners. *Q. Nov. 27*, 625.

Bai
  Powers and duties of Magistrates as regards admitting Prisoners to Bail. *Q. Nov. 26*, 506.

Baird, Mr. J. G. A. [Glasgow, Central]
  Glasgow Lawyer withholding damages awarded to his Client—Interlocutor issued by the Sheriff of Glasgow, *Nov. 27*, 613.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, W.]
  Business of the House, Course of Business—Statements and Replies to Questions, *Nov. 21*, 197; *Nov. 25*, 387; *Nov. 26*, 514, 515; *Dec. 4*, 1333.
  Cable Communication.
    India, All-British Cable—Construction of line connecting Cocos, Ceylon, and Singapore, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 925.
    Tristan da Cunha Islands, Value of, for telegraphic purposes — Retention under British Sovereignty, *Dec. 2*, 925.
  Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy—Government Agreement, Date of submitting to the House, *Nov. 26*, 513, 514.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 32, 41, 42, 44, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 76, 104, 105, 106, 119, 122; *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 414, 415, 420, 423, 446; *Nov. 26*, 520, 521, 522, 523, 580, 596, 597; *Nov. 27*, 712, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 722; *Nov. 28*, 772, 780; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 929, 930, 932, 939; *Dec. 3*, 1,151, 1,153, 1,170.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill.
    Age Limit for retention of Scholars in Elementary Schools, Pupils over fifteen, Discretionary Powers of Local Authorities — Redrafting Clause 23, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 631, 632.
    Amendments without Notice, *Nov. 27*, 633.
    Closure by Compartments—Limitation of Number of Questions to be put from the Chair, proposed, *Nov 20*, 29, 30.
    "Education," Definition of, *Nov. 26*, 512.
    Financial Proposals—Total Amount to be voted from Imperial Funds, *Nov. 25*, 386.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
    Ireland, Amount of Equivalent Grant, *Nov. 25*, 386.
    London.
      Date of Introduction of Bill dealing with London, *Nov. 24*, 249, 250.
      Elementary Schools—Amount of Grant payable for first twelve months, *Nov. 24*, 249.
    Religious Instruction, Separate Facilities—Mr. Balfour abstaining from voting on the Cecil Proposal, *Nov. 25*, 421, 423, 424, 437, 445, 446.
    Roman Catholic Schools, Amount of Grant to be paid to, *Nov. 20*, 30, 31.
    Schools transferred by a Denomination to a School Board, Position of, *Nov. 27*, 631.
    Teachers.
      Dismissal of Teachers on grounds not connected with Religious Instruction — Consent of Local Education Authority, *Nov. 26*, 513.
      Superannuation Rights, Provisions for Safeguarding, *Dec. 1* 854.
  Ireland — Changes in Constitution of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 250.
  Militia and Yeomanry Bill, Date of Second Reading — Facilities for Discussion, *Dec. 1*, 844.
  Parliamentary Procedure.
    Manuscript Amendments without Notice—Limitation of Practice, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 855.
    New Rules.
      Discussion of, Form of Motion, etc., *Nov. 26*, 515.
      Questions—Time occupied in the giving of Oral Answers to Questions, *Dec. 1*, 855.
      Return to former Rules next Session, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 386.
      Rules already passed as Sessional Orders, Conversion into Standing Orders. *Dec. 1*, 856, 867, 870, 871, 872, 874.
  Private Bills—Report of Select Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1067.
  Registration Laws, Amendment of—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 20*, 31.
  Session of 1902—Date of Termination, *Nov. 25*, 386.
  Session of 1903—Date of calling Parliament together, *Nov. 26*, 514.
  Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Date of Introduction of Bill giving effect to, Adequate Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *Nov. 27*, 630, 631.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

Unemployed.

Hardships entailed on the Working Classes during times of Trade Depression, Legislation proposed, *Nov. 27*, 622, 623.

Royal Commission of Inquiry, Appointment of, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 623.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W., *President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

Ireland.

Dublin, Deaths from Gas-poisoning—Percentage of Carburetted Water Gas supplied, *Dec. 4*, 1332.

Galway as a Transatlantic Port for Canadian Mail Service, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1332.

Rock Angus, Lighting of, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1331.

Railways.

Communication between Passengers and Guard, Provision of Apparatus in Passenger Carriages, *Dec. 4*, 1325.

Rates between Limerick and Liverpool — Action of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, *Nov. 27*, 629.

Mallaig West Highland Railway—Annual Report as to Condition and Working of, *Dec. 4*, 1326.

North British Railway, Towroping Accident at Ayton Station—Discontinuance of practice of Towroping proposed, *Nov. 26*, 504.

Scotland, Harbours—Grants-in-Aid, Relaxation of Regulations under which Grants-in-Aid are made, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 505.

Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.

British Exporters of Confectionery, Benefits derived from Article III., *Dec. 2*, 919, 920.

Colonies—Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Colonial Sugar, Interpretation of Article IV., *Dec. 2*, 920, 921.

Commercial Treaties, Effect on—Liberals and the Sugar Bounties, Position of the West Indies, Price of Sugar compared with Cost of Production, Countervailing Duties and Free Trade, etc., *Nov. 24*, 251, 267, 285, 287.

Shipping Trade, Effect of Ratification of Convention on, *Dec. 3*, 1060.

Surtax on Imports, Amount of—Equality of Import Duty on Goods throughout the Contracting Countries, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 919, 920.

Sugar Refineries, Number working in Great Britain, Number of Tons of Sugar refined in 1902, 1901, 1891, 1881, and 1871, *Nov. 20*, 17.

Ballaghaderreen

Dog Poisoning Cases at, Police Report.
Q. Dec. 1, 852.

Ballivor

Road to Hill of Down, Condition of.
Q. Nov. 20, 26.

Ballybrophy

Road from Station to Rathdonney, Condition of—Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed.
Q. Nov. 20, 24.

Ballymoney

Post Office, Amount of business transacted at, Reasons for abandonment of project of new Post Office, etc.
Q. Nov. 20, 29.

Banbridge

Petty Sessions—Prosecution of Campbell and Leary by Board of Guardians, Failure to convict.
Q. Nov. 27, 626.

Bank of England

Amount of Notes issued which have not been presented for payment—Return Presented, *Dec. 1*, 813, 834.

Barlow, Mr. J. E. [Somerset, Frome]

Bath Hospital Drainage System—Danger to Monkton Combe Water Supply, Inquiry, *Dec. 3*, 1060.

Barmaids

Scotland—Number of Women employed in Bars, Date of Issue of Return.
Q. Nov. 28, 748.

Barnett, Mr. W.

Murder of, in Argentina—Steps taken to secure punishment of Murderers.
Qs. Nov. 24, 243 ; *Dec. 3*, 1056.

Barracks

Naval Barracks at Chatham—Delay in Completion.
Q. Nov. 20, 6.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]

London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1348.

Barvas

Medical Officer's Report, Non-publication of.
Q. Nov. 27, 624.

Bath

Hospital Drainage System—Complaints as to, Danger to Water Supply of Monkton Combe, Inquiry.
Q. Dec. 3, 1060.

Bee-Keeping

Glasnevin, Lectures on Bee-keeping—Appointment of Mr. J. M. Gillies as Lecturer and Examiner, Qualifications, etc.
Qs. Dec. 1, 853 ; *Dec. 4*, 1329, 330

Beet Sugar, Bounties on
Brussels Convention, *see* Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.
Canadian Bounty, Rate of.
Q. Dec. 4, 1306.

Belfast
Army Bread Contract given to firm of Druggists and Chemists.
Qs. Nov. 27, 629; *Dec. 2,* 918.
National School Teachers—Payment of Balance of Grade Salary.
Q. Nov. 26, 509.
Post Office—Promotion, Claims of Senior Clerks.
Q. Nov. 20, 28.
Telegraph Service.
Office in Donegal Street. Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 508.
Superintending Engineer's Office—Assistants appointed from Ballina and Mullingar, Claims of Belfast Telegraphists..
Q. Nov. 27, 628.

Belgium
Coal—Decrease in Shipments from Great Britain since imposition of the Coal Duty.
Q. Nov. 24, 235.

Belmore, Earl of
Took the Oath, *Dec. 4,* 1189.

Beresford, Lord C. [Woolwich]
Army
Ninth Lancers, Collective Punishment by Government of India for a Crime not proved against them—Danger of outside Interference in matters of Discipline, Objections to Collective Punishment, etc., *Nov. 21,* 183, 185.
Pensions, Payment Weekly instead of Quarterly, proposed, *Nov. 28,* 747.
Navy
"Canopus," H.M.S.—Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron. State of Boilers, etc., *Dec. 4,* 1321.
Ordnance Store Department Vacancies, Appointment of Warrant Officers—Sub-Committee Report, *Nov. 21,* 148.
Woolwich Arsenal—Discharge of Workmen, Weekly output of Small Arms Ammunition, etc., *Nov. 26,* 499.

Berks, County of
Census—Return of Area, Houses and Population, Presented, *Nov. 20,* 1.

Betting
Circulars distributed by Post, Making a Punishable Offence, proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 840.

Bicycles
Riding on Footpaths—Number of Prosecutions and Convictions at Burnfoot Petty Sessions.
Q. Nov. 28, 748.

Bilbao
Harbour Lights—Defective System of Lighting, Representations to the Spanish Government.
Q. Nov. 27, 615.

Billesdon Church School, Leicestershire
Schoolmaster requested to resign for refusing to comply with the Vicar's Instructions.
Q. Dr. Macnamara, *Dec. 3,* 1072.

Bills
Money Bills and the House of Lords—Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, Question of Privilege, *see* title Money Bills.
Private Bills—Report of Select Committee.
Q. Dec. 3, 1067.

Birmingham
Education—Religious Instruction, Failure of separate Facilities Experiment. *References to, in Debate on the Education Bill, Nov. 25,* 413, 420, 421, 432; *Dec. 4,* 1221.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
"Education" Definition of, *Nov. 26,* 512.
Teachers—Dismissal of Teachers on grounds not connected with Religious Instruction, Consent of Local Education Authority, *Nov. 26,*513.

Blundell, Col. [Lancashire, Ince]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Voluntary School Teachers, Security of Tenure, *Nov. 26,* 500.

Boilers
See titles Navy and Mercantile Marine.

Bond, Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20,* 86.

Borneo, British
Coal, Supply of, to the China Squadron, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 502.
Mails—Arrangement with the P. and O. Steamship Company to call at a Port in British North Borneo, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 507.
Railway to the Interior, Date of completion.
Q. Nov. 20, 17.

Boroughs, Metropolitan
Subscriptions to the Association of Municipal Corporations disallowed by Auditors—Decision of the Local Government Board.
Q. Dec. 4, 1310.

Boscawen, Mr. G. [Kent, Tonbridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill *con. Nov 25,* 424, 433, 434, 435, 438; *Nov. 27,* 681.

Botha, Rev. J. F.
- South African War—Efforts to promote Peace, Public apology for Action.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 24*, 239.

Bounties
- Agricultural and other products.
  - Foreign Countries, Bounties given by—Return proposed.
    - *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 913.
  - Colonial Bounties on, Amounts of, etc.—Return proposed.
    - *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1307.
- Sugar Bounties, *see* that title.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. [Hackney, N.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 576, 577.
- London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1403, 1410, 1413, 1415, 1418.
- Telephone Service, Discrepancies between Post Office and National Telephone Company's Charges—Statement of Chairman of Establishments Committee of the London County Council, *Nov. 28*, 746.

Bowles, Mr. G. [Lynn Regis]
- Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 25*, 387; *Dec. 4*, 1333.
- Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy—Government Agreement, Date of submitting to the House, *Nov. 26*, 513.
- Irish Lights—Inaccuracies of Admiralty List, Revision and Correction of List, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 621.
- Osborne Estate Bill, 2R. *Nov. 21*, 211, 212, 213, 214.
- Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules.
  - Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Insufficient Experience of Working of New Rules, etc., *Dec. 1*, 856, 860, 861, 862, 871.
  - Form of Motion for making Sessional Orders Standing Orders, *Nov. 26*, 515.
- Persia.
  - British Trade Interests in the Persian Gulf, Safeguarding Interests, etc., *Dec. 1*, 846.
  - Karun River.
    - Ahwaz, Establishment of Russian Consulate at, *Dec. 1*, 845.
    - Customs Duties, Alterations in System of Collection by Belgian Authorities, *Dec. 1*, 845.
  - Railways and Public Works—Commission of Engineers sent from Paris to Survey Southern Persia alleged, *Dec. 1*, 846.
- Sugar Bounties.
  - Brussels Convention.
    - Bill giving effect to, Date of Introduction, Adequate opportunity for Discussion, etc. *Nov. 27*, 630.

Bowles, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- Sugar Bounties—*cont.*
  - Brussels Convention—*cont.*
    - Clauses, Doubts as to Interpretation of, Reference to be made to *proces verbal*, *Dec. 4*, 1308.
    - Colonies, Imposition of Countervailng Duties against British Self-governing Colonies—Interpretation of Article IV., *Dec. 2*, 920, 921; *Dec. 4*, 1312.
    - Russia, Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with (1859) — Steps taken by British Government to denounce Treaty, Effect on Convention, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1057, 1058, 1059.
    - Translation from French into English, Inconsistencies in English Version, Correction of Translation, etc., *Nov. 28*, 742; *Dec. 4*, 1322, 1323.
  - Canadian and Australian Bounties on Beet Sugar, Rates of, *Dec. 4*, 1306.
  - Cartels with Surtax, steps taken to abolish, *Dec. 4*, 1308.
- Zafarini Islands, Acquisition of, by Russia as a Coaling Station, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Boy Copyists
- Irish Examination Centres—Inclusion of Londonderry.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1049.

Boycotting and Intimidation in Ireland
- Number of Persons and Families boycotted throughout Ireland.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1327.

Bradford
- Education Bill, Working of — Father Goss's Invitation to the City Council to assist in control of St. Patrick's Schools.
  - *O.* Mr. Wanklyn, *Nov. 27*, 697.

Brassey Mr. A. [Oxon, Banbury]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Position of Church of England Elementary Schools not under Trust Deeds, *Dec. 1*, 835.

Bread
- Army Contract at Belfast given to firm of Druggists and Chemists.
  - *Qs.* *Nov. 27*, 629; *Dec. 2*, 918.

Bridgerule National School
- Religious Instruction at—Nonconformist Children withdrawn, Inquiry proposed.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 911.

Brigg, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Keighley]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 526; *Nov. 28*, 770

British Empire
Empire Day, Establishment of 24th May as Holiday in State-aided Schools—Instruction in Matters appertaining to the Empire and its Responsibilities, etc. proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 813, 819; Marquis of Londonderry, 821.

British Museum
Irish Gold Ornaments, Return to Ireland—Date of Trial of Case.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1315.

British South African Company
Financial Statements for 1900-1901 and 1901-1902 and Estimates for 1901-1902 and 1902-1903, *Nov. 24*, 217, 227.

Broad Bay
Illegal Trawling.
Cruiser for protection of Interests of Line Fishermen, Application for Treasury Grant.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 922.

Frequent occurrence of Cases—Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 507.

Tiumpan Head Lighthouse, Detections of Trawling from—Extension of System to other Lighthouses on the Scottish Coast, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 624.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 26*, 574.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*Secretary of State for War* [Surrey, Guildford]
Africa, South
Blockhouses erected during the War, Cost of, Sale by Tender, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1317.

British Troops, Pay and Allowances, *Dec. 4*, 1316.

Pretoria Field Force Canteen—Regulations as to Contracts, *Dec. 2*, 919.

Soldiers, Number discharged in South Africa, Inducements to settle in the Colonies, etc., *Nov. 26*, 501.

Ammunition, Defective Ammunition—Names of Officials responsible for Manufacture, Testing, etc., *Dec. 2*, 917.

Contracts—Belfast Barracks, Bread Contract given to firm of Druggists and Chemists. *Dec, 2*, 919.

Examination Text-books, Difficulty of obtaining, *Nov. 20*, 14.

Leonard, Sergeant, Degradation to the Ranks—Public Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 26*, 501, 502; *Dec. 4*, 1318.

Officers' Uniforms, Alterations—Cost of Constant Alterations, *Nov. 24*, 241, 242.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*cont.*
Reserve, Strength of—Effect of new proposals for re-engagement of Time-expired men, *Dec. 4*, 1317.

Sandhurst Military College—Cadets' Messing Allowances, Extra Charges, Insufficient Food, etc., alleged, *Dec. 2*, 918.
South African War Medals—Queen's Medals and King's Medals, Reconsideration of Regulations as to Distribution, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 241.

Tattoo and Roll Calls, Abolition of—Army Order of Sept., *Nov. 26*, 502.

Volunteers, Capitation Grants and Camp Leave—Regulations of April 22, 1902, *Nov. 20*, 14.

Brookfield, Col. [Sussex, Rye]
Army, Reserve of Officers—Gratuities, Eligibility for benefits under paragraph 601*a* of the Royal Warrant, Deductions on Income derived from Gratuities, etc., *Nov. 27*, 615, 616.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 28*, 791.

Brussels Sugar Convention
see Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
Business of the House—Course of business *Nov. 26*, 514, 515.

Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy—Government Agreement, Date of Submitting to the House, *Nov. 26*, 514.

Education—Fees Charged in Elementary Schools, Return showing Schools in which Fees are Charged, Number of Scholars, Amount of Fee, etc., proposed, *Dec. 1*, 847.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 33, 43, 48, 49, 61, 65, 66, 67, 73, 88; *con.* *Nov. 25*, 407, 409, 411, 413, 414, 415, 435, 449; *Nov. 26*, 525, 526, 569, 571, 572, 577, 604, 605; *Nov. 27*, 644, 645, 646; *Nov. 28*, 759, 772, 777, 779, 791, 794, 810; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 1017, 1028, 1032; *Dec. 3*, 1098, 1101.

Education (England and Wales Bill—Date of Introduction of Bill dealing with London, *Nov. 24*, 250.

Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules.
Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Insufficient Experience of Working of Rules, etc., *Dec. 1* 888.

Hour of Meeting of the House, Discussion of, *Nov. 26*, 515.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Mortgaged Lands, Extension of Ordinance Suspending Right of Sale or Foreclosure, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 238, 239.

Bull, Mr. W. J. [Hammersmith]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 606.

Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway
Arbitrators, Appointment of, prior to opening the Line for Traffic.
Q. Nov. 28, 747.
Donegal Grand Jury, Guarantee of Capital, Carrying out Terms previous to appointment of Arbitrators.
Q. Dec. 3, 1051.
Tax levied on Guaranteeing Area, Payment by the County Council of Donegal —Illegality of Charge, alleged, Refunding Money to the Ratepayers, etc.
Q. Dec. 1, 849.

Bundoran
Railway Line to Sligo, Construction of, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 382.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
Treaty between Great Britain and Russia alleged to have been signed in 1844, *Nov. 26*, 503, 504.

Burnfoot
Bicycles, Riding on Footpaths—Number of Prosecutions and Convictions at Petty Sessions.
Q. Nov. 28, 748.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1356, 1357, 1395.
Unemployed—Local Authorities putting in hand Works of Sanitation and Improvement with a view to providing work, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 621, 622.

Bushey Park
Concession of Land to United Tramways Company, alleged.
Q. Nov. 24, 236.

Business of the House
Amendments without notice, Objections to—Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Q. Nov. 27, 633.
Course of Business—Mr. Balfour's Statements and Replies to Questions, etc., *Nov. 21*, 197; *Nov. 25*, 386; *Nov. 26*, 514; *Dec. 4*, 1332, 1333.
Procedure, New Rules—Curtailment of Private Members' Rights, alleged.
Observations on Motion to Convert Sessional into Standing Orders, *Dec. 1*, 859, 860, 861, 871, 885, 897, 898, 890.
Questions—Time occupied in giving Oral Answers to Questions.
Q. Dec. 1, 855.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]
Army—Sergeant Leonard, Degradation to the Ranks—Public Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 501.
South African War Medals — Queen's Medals and King's Medals, Reconsideration of Regulations as to Distribution, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 241.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 35, 47, 50; *con. Nov. 25*, 470.
Education (England and Wales) Bill
London Elementary Schools, Amount of Grant payable for first twelve months, *Nov. 24*, 249.
Proportion of Taxation to be paid by London, *Nov. 24*, 234.
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1335, 1338, 1339, 1357, 1397, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, 1407, 1417.
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Sugar from British Self-governing Colonies, *Dec. 4*, 1308.

Cable Communication
India, *see* that title.
Pacific Cable—Money issued from Consolidated Fund under Provisions of Act of 1901—Account presented, *Nov. 24*, 218, 227.
Tristan da Cunha Islands, Value of for Telegraphic purposes–Retention under British Sovereignty.
Q. Dec. 2, 925.
Vancouver to Fanning Island Cable—Special Trials, Results of Tests.
Q. Dec. 4, 1305.

Caithness
Norwegian Trawlers in Scotch Waters—Representation to the Norwegian Government.
Q. Nov. 20, 23.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid]
Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 1*, 906, 907.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1391.
Mail Ships Bill, 2R. *Dec. 1*, 906.
Osborne Estate Bill, 2R. *Nov. 21*, 198, 210, 211.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Nov. 25*, 386; *Dec. 4*, 1332.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 25*, 443, 446; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 934, 971.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1339, 1409.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Insufficient and unsatisfactory Experience of Working of New Rules, Referring to a Committee, proposed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 877, 899.

Camperdown, Earl of
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1290.
Privilege—House of Lords and Money Bills. Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, *Dec. 1*, 832.

Canada
  Cattle.
    Cattle imported into Great Britain—Slaughtering at Landing Ports, Extension of time limit, proposed.
      Q. *Nov. 20*, 18.
    Tuberculosis, Freedom from—Comparisons with English Cattle.
      Q. *Nov. 20*, 19.
  Mail Service to Great Britain—Galway as a Transatlantic port, proposed.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1332.
  Sugar Bounties, Rates of.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1306.

Canals, Ireland
  Tolls—Midland Great Western Railway Charges, Inquiry, proposed.
    Q. *Dec. 1*, 842.

"Canopus," H.M.S.
  Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron, State of Boilers, etc.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1320, 1321.

Canteens
  Pretoria Field Force Canteen— Regulations as to Contracts.
    Q. *Dec. 2*, 919.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1220.

Canterbury Workhouse
  Army and Navy Reservists in—Exemption from Stone-breaking proposed.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1311.

Cardiff
  Accident on Great Western Railway on November 14—Inquiry.
    Q. *Nov. 21*, 147.

Carew, Mr. T. L. [Meath, S.]
  Ireland.
    Athy Publican prosecuted by the Police for serving a drunken Man—Case of P. Knowles, *Nov. 20*, 23.
    Poor Law Medical Officers—Holiday Grievance.
      Q. *Dec. 1*, 854.
    Railways.
      Carndonagh - Buncrana Railway, Tax levied on guaranteeing Area, Payment of by the County Council of Donegal—Illegality of Charge, alleged, Refunding Money to the Ratepayers, etc., *Dec. 1*, 849.
      State Purchase of—Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 850.
    Roads.
      Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Condition of Road—Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 24.
      Hill of Down to Ballinor, Condition of Road, *Nov. 25*, 26.
    Workhouses—Infirm Inmates, Treatment of, *Dec. 1*, 854.

Carndonagh-Buncrana Railway
  see Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway.

Cartel System
  see Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.

Castlerea
  Sandford Estate—Purchase of by the Congested Districts Board, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 25*, 385.

Cattle and Live Stock
  Argentine Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for slaughter—Progress of Negotiations with the Argentine Government.
    Qs. *Nov. 20*, 11, 19; *Nov. 27*, 623.
  Bovine Tuberculosis, Comparisons of Home and Canadian Cattle—Report to the Corporation of Glasgow.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 19.
  Canadian Cattle imported into Great Britain — Slaughtering at Landing Ports, Extension of time limit, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 18.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—Voluntary School Teachers, Compensation to Teachers not engaged by Local Authorities, *Dec. 1*, 547.
  Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Discussion of, *Nov. 26*, 515.

Cavendish, Mr. R. F. [Lancashire, North Lonsdale]
  Salmon Fisheries Commission Report—Introduction of Bill to carry out Recommendations, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1307.

Cecil, Lord Hugh [Greenwich]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 20*, 49, 63, 65; *com.* *Nov. 25*, 401, 409, 411, 413, 414; *Nov. 26*, 550, 551, 582; *Nov. 27*, 661, 663, 688, 705, 714, 718, 719, 722; 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1107, 1110.

Celtic Gold Ornaments
  Restoration of Ornaments in the British Museum to Ireland—Date of trial of case.
    Q. *Dec. 4*, 1315.

Census
  England and Wales, Area, Houses, and Population—Return Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1; *Dec. 2*, 910; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Central London Railway
  Vibration—Carrying out suggestions of Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 26*, 498.

Central Telegraph Office
  see Telegraph Service.

Chairman of Committees (Lords)
  Earl of Morley.

Chairman of Committees
- *Right Hon. J. W. Lowther.*

Chamberlain Mr. A.—*Postmaster General* [Worcestershire, E.]
- Africa, South.
  - Customs Duties—Exemption of Articles imported for use of the British Troops, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 916.
  - Permit Regulations, *Dec. 4*, 1316.
- Borneo Mails—Arrangement with the P. and O. Steamship Company to call at a port in British North Borneo, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 507.
- Indentured Labour in the West Indies and British Guiana—Number of Labourers imported during the last five years, *Nov. 20*, 16.
- Ireland.
  - Armagh Post Office Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged, *Dec. 2*, 923.
  - Ballymoney and Portrush Post offices—Amount of business transacted, Provision of New Post Offices, etc., *Nov. 20*, 29.
  - Belfast.
    - Post Office—Promotion, Claims of Senior Clerks, *Nov. 20*, 29.
    - Telegraph Service.
      - Donegal Street, Office in, Establishment of, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 508, 509.
      - Superintending Engineers Office — Assistants appointed from Ballina and Mullingar, Claims of Belfast Telegraphists, *Nov. 27*, 628.
  - Hill Street Postal Service—Sunday Delivery of Letters, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 849.
  - Mail Car Contractors—Losses incurred through Unpunctuality of Trains, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1326.
  - Telephone Service—Rural Districts, Telephonic Communications between, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 848.
- Irish Language—Refusal of Postal Authorities to furnish Money Order because Names of Payee and Remitter were in Irish, *Nov. 26*, 508.
- Parcels Post—Establishment of Agricultural Parcels Post, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1327.
- Scotland.
  - Mail Service in the Western Hebrides—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in Transit, etc., *Nov. 24*, 245, 246.
  - Stornoway Mail Service—Refusal of Messrs. MacBrayne to convey Goods from Stornoway to Kyle, *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Chamberlain, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- South African War—Peace Terms, Protest of Boer Generals to Lord Kitchener, Publication of, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1055.
- Telephone Service — Tunbridge Wells Municipal Telephone System, Purchase by the National Telephone Company — Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk — Local Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 1*, 846.
- Transvaal and Orange River Colony Grant-in-aid—Grant to Boers.
  - Administration of, Local Authorities entrusted with, *Dec. 2*, 915, 916.
  - Amount expended, Purchase of diseased Animals, alleged, Provision of Agricultural Machinery, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 13.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, W.]
- Africa, South.
  - Loyalists, Treatment of, Persecution by Boycotting—Cases of Rev. Mr. Vlok and Rev. J. F. Botha, *Nov. 24*, 240.
  - Press Censorship, Removal of Restrictions on Letters and Cablegrams, *Nov. 24*, 238.
- Sugar Bounties.
  - Brussels Convention.
    - Free Trade, Cobden's Definition of, Survival of Bounties as Surtax, Object of Bounty, System of Foreign Powers, Position of West Indies, Price of Sugar, Tax on Consumer, etc., *Nov. 24*, 338, 344, 346.
    - United States, Non-Representation of, *Nov. 24*, 286.
  - Countervailing Duties—Attitude and Speeches of Mr. Chamberlain in 1881, etc.
    - *Observations in Debate on Sugar Bounties Convention, Nov. 24*, 272, 293, 316, 349.
  - Maximum Bounty, Amount of, etc., *Nov. 24*, 279.
- Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
  - Mortgaged Lands—Ordinance suspending Right of Sale or Foreclosure, Extension of, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 238, 239.
  - Repatriation Commissions, Number appointed, Constitution of, etc., *Dec. 2*, 915, 916.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
- *Sir William Walrond.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer
- *Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.*

Channel Fleet
- Statistics of efficient Seamen.
  - *Q. Nov. 20*, 5.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
Dogs—Importation of Dogs from Abroad, Number of Cases of Rabies, *Nov. 26,* 496, 497; *Dec. 4,* 1302.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25.* 392, 465; *Nov. 26,* 529; *Nov. 28,* 757.
Session of 1903—Date of calling Parliament together, *Nov. 26,* 514.

Chapman, Mr. E. [Cheshire, Hyde]
Africa, South—Provisions made for Elementary Education, Religious Instruction, etc., *Dec. 3,* 1053.

Chartered Company of South Africa
see British South Africa Company.

Chatham
Naval Barracks, Delay in Completion.
Q. Nov. 20, 6.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.

Children
Cruelty to, Penruddocke case, *see* Penruddocke.
Pauper Children, *see* that title.

China
Military Operations of 1900—Issue of Clasp for Tientsin, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1314.
Railways — Russian Branch Line from Main Siberian Railway to Pekin, Alleged Construction of.
Q. Dec. 1, 837.
Shangai.
Withdrawal of International Troops, Correspondence relating to, Presented, *Dec. 2,* 909, 910.
Date of Withdrawal.
Q. Nov. 25, 381.
Yang-tsze Valley.
International Situation in, Effect on position of Great Britain.
Q. Dec. 4, 1312.

China Squadron
British North Borneo, Supplying Coal to the Squadron, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 502.
Seymour Challenge Cup for good Shooting — Position of Ship holding at Parades on Shore, etc.
Q. Dec. 4, 1321.

Civil List Act of Queen Anne
Provisions and Restrictions of, as to Crown Property.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21,* 201.

Civil Service
Ireland — Boy Copyists' Examination Centres, Inclusion of Lordonderry in list of Centres, proposed.
Q. Dec. 3, 1049.

Civil Service—*cont.*
Pensions and Superannuations.
Appointments requiring Special Qualifications—Treasury Minute presented, *Dec. 4,* 1189, 1301.
Royal Commission of Inquiry—Date of Nomination, Terms of Reference, etc.
Q. Dec. 1, 842.

Civil Surgeons
South African War Gratuity—Non-participation of Surgeons employed at home, Terms of Agreement, etc.
Qs. Nov. 27, 618; *Dec. 1,* 843.

Clement Estate, Leitrim
Fair Rent Applications.
Q. Nov. 24, 248.

Cleveland Parliamentary Election
Leaflet, Existence of, alleged, stating that if the Education Bill were passed, Universal payment of School Fees would be enforced.
Os. Mr. Talbot, *Dec. 3,* 1134, 1138; Mr. Herbert Samuel, 1138.

Clifford, Dr.
Statement with reference to the Education Bill.
Os. Mr. Talbot, *Dec. 3,* 1133; Mr. Griffith, 1150.

Coal
China Squadron—Supplying with Coal from British North Borneo, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 502.
Export Duty.
Pernau, Russia—Decrease in Imports of British Coal since imposition of the Coal Duty.
Q. Nov. 27, 611.
Shipments to Holland, Belgium and Baltic Ports, Decrease in, since imposition of Coal Duty.
Q. Nov. 24, 235.

Coastguards
Ilfracombe—Failure of Coastguard to keep proper Look-out, alleged.
Q. Nov. 27, 610.

Cobden, Richard
Free Trade—Definition of.
Os. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24,* 267; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 342.

Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.—*Under Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Ayrshire, N.]
Sunday Closing, Wales — Effect of Licensing Act of 1902, Issue of Explanatory Notice in Welsh, proposed, *Nov. 20,* 18.

Cockerton Judgment
Decision "controlled" by the Government, alleged.
Observations in Debate on the Education Bill, Dec. 2, 960, 966.
Education, Legislation necessitated by.
O. Duke of Devonshire, *Dec. 4,* 1195, 1196.

Coghill, Mr. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Ireland — Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, Changes in Constitution, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 250.

Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Return to the former Rules next Session, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385, 386.

Cohen, Mr. B. [Islington, E.]
London Water Bill, *com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1346, 1403.

Coleridge, Lord
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1257, 1259, 1266.

Collisions
Windermere Lake, Vessels Navigating—Rules for Prevention of Collisions, Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217.

Colomb, Sir J. [Great Yarmouth]
Dingle Licensing Case—Action of the Bench in granting New Licences, *Dec. 1*, 835.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.
Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Onslow.

Colonies
Agricultural Products, Amounts of Bounties on—Return proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1307.

Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741, 742 ; *Dec. 3*, 1049 ; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Empire Day, Establishment of May 24th as Holiday in State-aided Schools—Instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its Responsibilities, proposed.
Qs. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 813, 819 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 821.

Sugar Bounties
Brussels Convention, Position of Colonies under, *see* Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention.

Names of Colonies granting, Rates of Bounties, etc.
Q. Dec. 4, 1306.

Trading Companies, Parliamentary and Municipal Representation — Circular Despatch Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146 ; *Nov. 24*, 217.

Commercial Education, Scotland
Encouragement of—Removal of Age Restrictions on Certificates, etc.
Q. Dec. 3, 1064.

Commercial Treaties
Brussels Sugar Convention and the Most-Favoured Nation Clause, *see* Sugar Bounties.

Companies
Employees of Public Companies, Income Tax—Revenue Officers requesting information as to Salaries paid to Employees.
Qs. Nov. 25, 382 ; *Dec. 4*, 1324, 1325.

Compton, Lord A. [Beds., Biggleswade]
Indian Army.
Lancers, 9th, Collective Punishment by Government of India for a Crime not proved against them—Previous Cases of Illtreatment of Natives, Death in present case not due to Assault, etc., *Nov. 21* 194, 197.

Taxation—Exemption of, of Instruments for Bands and Articles of Military Dress, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 503.

Confectionery
Brussels Sugar Convention—Benefits derived by British Exporters of Confectionery from Article III. of the Convention.
Q. Dec. 2, 919.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Horse-breeding Experiments — Amount expended by the Board during the last two years.
Q. Nov. 27, 627.

Sandford Estate, Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 385.

Staff—Number of Officials and Clerks employed.
Q. Nov. 27, 627.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland
Loch Holm, Construction of Dry Dock—Petition for Grant from the Congested Districts Board.
Q. Dec. 1, 838.

Road Construction in Western Ross-shire—Grant-in-aid.
Q. Dec. 4, 1303.

Consolidated Fund
Money issued under Provisions of Pacific Cable Act—Account Presented, *Nov. 24*, 218, 227.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [No. 2] Bill
l. 1R.* *Nov. 20*, 2.
2R. and 3R.* *Nov. 24*, 218.
Royal Assent, *Nov. 25*, 373.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Athy Publican prosecuted for serving Drunken Man, Police permitting the man to enter the premises.
Q. Nov. 20, 23.

Bagnalstown Petty Sessions Summons—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summons in cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners.
Q. Nov. 27, 625.

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*

De Freyne Estate—Cost of Extra Police. *Q. Nov. 20*, 27.

Fahy, Michael, Fine imposed on, for an attack on Dwelling house—Alleged Misrepresentation by the Police. *Q. Nov. 20*, 511.

Glenville, United Irish League Meeting at—Interference with, alleged. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1313.

Marine Store Dealers Act, Enforcement of—Number of Prosecutions, etc. *Qs. Nov. 20*, 26; *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Phœnix Park Depôt—Prevalence of Infectious Diseases, Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed. *Q. Nov. 25*, 385.

Rogers, District Inspector—Occupancy of Trim Military Barracks, Yearly Lodging Allowance made to Inspector Rogers. *Q. Dec. 1*, 852.

Tallow—Cost of Extra Police, Area of Charge, etc *Q. Dec. 1*, 852.

Contracts

Army—Bread Contract at Belfast given to firm of Druggists and Chemists. *Qs. Nov 27*, 629; *Dec. 2*. 918.

"Parliamentary Debates," *see* that title.

Convicts

Lynchehaun, Escape from Maryborough Gaol—Changes made in Prison Staff in consequence. *Q. Nov. 20*, 28.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]

Ireland.

Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church—Precedence of, *Nov. 24*, 246.

Rock Angus, Lighting of, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1331.

Corkly Orange Lodge

Keady, Visit to, Discharge of Firearms on the Public Road—Conduct of the Police, etc. *Q. Nov. 27*, 627.

Cornwall, County of

Census—Return of Area, Houses, and Population, Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Coronation of King Edward

Indian Celebrations—Cost of Durbar at Delhi to be provided by the Indian Exchequer. *O.* Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 158.

Cottage Homes

Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, etc. *Q. Nov. 20*, 9.

Count Out of the House

see Quorum.

County Councils, Ireland

Electoral Divisions—Inquiry into Boundaries, proposed *Q. Nov. 24*, 246.

Union Solicitors, Eligibility for Membership of County Councils—Position of Poor Law Medical Officers. *Q. Nov. 20*, 27.

Cranborne, Lord — *Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Rochester]

Afghanistan—Commercial Relations between Russia and Afghanistan, Direct Communication between the Russian Government and the Amir, alleged, *Dec. 1*, 845.

Argentina—Murder of Mr. W. Barnett, Steps taken to secure punishment of Murderers, *Nov. 24*, 243; *Dec. 3*, 1057.

Borneo, British North Borneo—Railway to the Interior, Date of completion, *Nov. 20*, 17.

Kobe—Beverages exported during 1900–1901, Nature and value of, *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Persia.

British Trade Interests in the Persian Gulf, Steps taken to secure, *Dec. 1*, 846.

Karun River.

Ahwaz, Establishment of Russian Consulate at, *Dec. 1*, 845.

Customs Duties, Alterations in system of Collection made by the Belgian Authorities, *Dec 1*, 845.

Railways and Public Works—Commission of Engineers sent from Paris to survey Southern Persia, alleged, *Dec. 1*, 846.

Russia—Treaty between Great Britain and Russia, alleged to have been signed in 1844, *Nov. 26*, 503, 504.

Shanghai, Date of withdrawal of International Troops, *Nov. 25*, 382.

Somaliland Operations—Names of Battalions of King's African Rifles ordered for Service, *Nov. 24*, 244.

Sugar Duties—Brussels Convention.

Russia, Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with (1859)—Steps taken by the British Government to denounce, Effect on the Brussels Sugar Convention, *Dec. 3*, 1058, 1059; *Dec. 4*, 1323.

Translation from French to English, Mistakes in, Provision of revised translation, *Dec. 4*, 1323.

Uganda and British East Africa—Issue of Government Paper Currency, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 17; *Nov. 24*, 244.

Zafarini Islands, Acquisition of, by Russia as a Coaling Station, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]

Telegraph Service—Central Office Staff Pay Grievance, *Nov. 26*, 495, 496.

Crimes [Ireland] Act, 1887.
Imprisonment of Members of Parliament under, Compulsory performance of Menial tasks, Washing Clothes, etc., alleged.
Q. Dec. 4, 1330, 1331.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Cockerton Judgment, Decision "controlled" by the Government, alleged, *Dec. 2,* 966.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27,* 651, 660, 664 ; 3R. *Dec. 2,* 965, 966, 967, 968, 971.
Voluntary Schools, Jobbery in Distribution of Special Aid Grant—Charge against Diocesan Boards, *Dec. 2,* 965, 966.

Crofters and Cottars [Scotland]
Lewis, Island of.
Provision of Holdings for Cottars, Utilising Deer Forests, proposed.
Qs. Dec. 2, 921 ; *Dec. 3,* 1063, 1064.
Trades and Handicrafts, Teaching of—Recommendations of Commission.
Q. Dec. 3, 1064.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Scotland—Number of Women employed as Barmaids, Date of Issue of Return, *Nov. 28,* 747.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26,* 589.
Raw Sugar, Value of, *Nov. 24,* 282.
South African War—Veterinary Surgeons, Employment of Surgeons not Members of the R.C.V.S., *Nov. 20,* 11.
Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act—Steps taken to make public Provisions of, *Nov. 20,* 22, 23.

Cross, Visc.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4,* 1241, 1242, 1243.

Crown
Acts of Parliament affecting the Crown only when specially made to apply to it.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21,* 205.
Private Property, Laws affecting the Power of the Crown to own and dispose of Private Property.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21,* 201.

Crown Private Estates Act, 1862
Provisions of, etc.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21,* 203, 204.

Cruelty to Animals
Nottingham, Case of J. Younger—Further Inquiry proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 375.

Cruelty to Children
Penruddocke Case, *see* that title.

Cruisers
see titles Navy and Mercantile Marine.

Cuba
Sugar Industry, Condition of.
Os. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 24,* 281 ; Mr. Partington, 325.
Increase in Production, Prospects of — Dangerous Rivalry with West Indian Sugar.
Os. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 24,* 283 ; Mr. Cust, 336.

Cumberland
Census of Area, Houses, and Population—Return Presented, *Dec. 2,* 910 ; *Dec. 4,* 1189.

Cunard Steamship Company
Subsidy, Government Agreement, Date of submitting to the House.
Q. Nov. 26, 513.

Cust, Mr. H. J. C. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Amount of Sugar imported into England from West Indies, Amount imported from Continent, Position of the West Indies, Position of the Colonies, etc., *Nov. 24,* 327.

Customs Duties
Africa, South—Articles imported for use of the British Army, Exemption from Duty, proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 916.

Dale, Dr., of Birmingham
Opinion of, on Unsectarian Religious Instruction.
O. Mr. Platt-Higgins, *Nov. 26,* 527.

Davey, Lord
Money Bills and the House of Lords, Financial Clauses of the Education Bill—Question of Privilege, *Dec. 1,* 823, 826, 827, 831.
Patent Law Amendment Bill, *com. Nov. 20,* 3.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
South African War—Peace Terms, Boer Generals' Protest — Laying on the Table Proposed, *Dec. 3,* 1055.
Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
Boers, Grant to.
Administration of, Local Authorities entrusted with, *Dec. 2,* 915, 916.
Amount Expended, Purchase of Diseased Animals, alleged, Provision of Agricultural Machinery, proposed, *Nov. 20,* 13.
Repatriation Commissions, Number Appointed, Constitution of, etc., *Dec. 2,* 915, 916.

De Freyne Estate
Police—Cost of Extra Police.
Q. Nov. 20, 27.

Denbigh, Earl of
Osborne Estate Bill, 2R. *Nov. 24*, 222.

Denny, Col. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
India.
Private Capital and Enterprise, Need for—Official Impediments, etc, *Nov. 21*, 157.
Railways—Contracts given to German Firms, Penalties for Delays.
Q. Nov. 21, 148.
Naval Boilers. Trials of—Date of Issue of Report, *Nov. 28*, 747.

Devine, Jane
Longford Boarding-out Case—Guardians' Action against Jane Devine, *Nov. 27*, 627.

Devonshire, Duke of—*Lord President of the Council*
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1190, 1209, 1211, 1259, 1286, 1287.
Money Bills and the House of Lords, Financial Clauses of the Education Bill—Question of Privilege, *Dec. 1*, 826, 831, 833.
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for Discussion by the House of Lords prior to Ratification, *Nov. 24*, 219.

Dewar, Mr. John [Inverness]
Mail Service in the Western Hebrides—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in Transit, etc., *Nov 24*, 245.

Dewar, Sir T. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Africa, South—Soldiers, Number discharged in South Africa, Inducements to settle in the Colonies, *Nov. 26*, 500.
Bail—Powers and Duties of Magistrates as regards admitting Prisoners to Bail, *Nov. 26*, 506.

Dickson, Mr. C. Scott—*Solicitor-General for Scotland* [Glasgow, Bridgton]
Lewis, Island of, Provision of Holdings for Cottars and Crofters—Utilising Deer Forests proposed, *Dec. 2*, 922.
Trawling—Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay—Cruiser for Protection of Interests of Line Fishermen, Application for Treasury Grant, *Dec. 2*, 922.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts., Chippenham]
London County Council—Travelling Expenses of Committee, Objections to Defraying out of Public Funds, *Nov. 25*, 382.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1349.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Army, Strength of—Effect of New Proposals for Re-engagement of Time-expired Men, *Dec. 4*, 1317.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C.—*cont.*
Cable Communication.
India, All-British Cable—Construction of Line connecting Cocos, Ceylon, and Singapore, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 925.
Tristan da Cunha Islands, Value of, for Telegraphic Purposes—Retention under British Sovereignty, *Dec. 2*, 925.
Education.
Cockerton Judgment, Decision "controlled" by the Government, alleged, *Dec. 2*, 960, 966.
Voluntary Schools, Jobbery in Distribution of Special Aid-Grant—Charge against Diocesan Boards, *Dec. 2*, 959, 965, 966.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 118; *con. Nov. 26*, 518, 521, 540; *Nov. 28*, 762, 771, 791; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 956, 957, 958, 959, 965, 966, 967.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Amendments without Notice, Objections to, *Nov. 27*, 632, 633.
Navy—Amount of Practice Ammunition allowed for Heavy Guns, *Nov. 25*, 379.
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Effect of Ratification of Convention on Shipping Trade, *Dec. 3*, 1059.

Dimsdale, Sir J. C. [London]
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1394.

Dingle
Licensing Case—Action of the Bench in granting new Licences.
Q. Dec. 1, 836.

Dinner Hour
Procedure, New Rules—Adjournment for Dinner.
Observations on Motion to convert Sessional into Standing Orders, Dec. 1, 863, 873, 877, 879.

Diseases of Animals
Orders in Council Presented, *Dec. 2*, 909, 910.
Rabies—Number of Cases among Dogs imported from Abroad.
Qs. Nov. 26, 496; *Dec. 4*, 1302.

Disorder in the House
Procedure, New Rules—Power for Speaker to Adjourn the House or Suspend Sitting, Objections to granting Power of Adjournment, etc.
Observations in Debate on Motion to convert Sessional into Standing Orders, Dec. 1, 858, 883, 883, 885, 888, 891, 893, 894, 896.

Dispensary Medical Officers, Ireland
see title Medical Officers, Ireland.

Disraeli, Mr. C. R. [Cheshire Altrincham]
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Referring Rules to a Committee, proposed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 884.

Dogs
Importation of Dogs from Abroad—Number of cases of Rabies.
Qs. Nov. 26, 496; *Dec. 4*, 1302.
Poisoning Cases, at Ballaghaderreen, Police Report as to.
Q. Dec. 1, 852.

Donegal
Buncrana-Carndonagh Railway, *see* that title.
Telephone Service—Guarantees given to the Post Office for Trunk Extensions.
Q. Nov. 28, 745.

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 28*, 781; 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1116.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Bail—Powers and Duties of Magistrates as regards admitting Prisoners to Bail, *Nov. 26*, 506.
Irish Presbyterian Church, Precedence of Moderator of General Assembly, *Nov. 24*, 246.
Kensit, Mr. J. A., Imprisonment of—Reduction of Sentence, Special Circumstances of the Case, *Nov. 27*, 623
Penruddocke Cruelty Case, Decision of the Judge—Alteration of Law, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 506.
Sunday Closing, Wales—Translation of Licensing Act of 1902 into Welsh, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1324.

Down County
Dromore Disturbances—Police Protection for Mr. Russell.
Qs. Nov. 24, 248; *Nov. 26*, 510.

Downpatrick
Sunday Demonstrations during Church hours, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 850.

Drainage
Bath Hospital—Danger caused to Monkton Combe Water Supply by, Inquiry.
Q. Dec. 3, 1060.

Dromod Pier
Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for construction of Pier.
Q. Dec. 2, 923.

Dromore
Disturbances at—Police Protection for Mr. Russell.
Qs. Nov. 24, 248; *Nov. 26*, 510.

Dublin
Gas Poisoning, Deaths from—Percentage of Carburetted Water Gas supplied.
Q. Dec. 4, 1332.
Phœnix Park Constabulary Depôt—Prevalence of Infectious Diseases, Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 385.
Post Office—Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists.
  Clerical Staff in Accountant's Office—Recruiting from the ranks of Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists, proposed.
  Q. Nov. 24, 232.
  Performance of Postmen's Duties alleged.
  Q. Nov. 24, 232.
Upper O'Connell Street, Premises in, locked up by the Police, alleged.
Q. Dec. 4, 1330.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 702.

Duncan, Mr. J. H. [Yorks., W.R., Otley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25*, 485; *Nov. 28*, 790.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Powers of Local Authorities to appoint Governors of Secondary Schools, *Dec. 1*, 847.

Dürr Boilers
Naval Ships fitted with—Results of Trials.
Q. Nov. 20, 15.

East India
see India.

East India Railway Co.
Contracts given to German firms—Delay in Shipping Engines, Penalties.
Q. Nov. 21, 148.

Edinburgh
Waverley Station, Accident to Shunter—Board of Trade recommendation.
Q. Nov. 25, 375.

Education
Africa, South—Provision made for Elementary Education, Religious Instruction, etc.
Q. Dec. 3, 1053.
Bridgerule National School, Religious Instruction at—Nonconformist Children withdrawn, Inquiry proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 911.
Cockerton Judgment—
  Decision "controlled" by the Government, alleged.
  Observations in Debate on Education Bill, Dec. 2, 960, 966.
Education, Legislation necessitated by—
O. Duke of Devonshire, *Dec. 4*, 1195, 1196.
Empire Day, Establishment of May 24 as Holiday in State-aided Schools—Instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its Responsibilities, etc., proposed.
Os. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 813, 819; Marquess of Londonderry, 821.
[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*

Evening Schools—Grants payable under Section XX. of the Regulations, Increased Payments for Increased Efficiency, etc.
Q. *Nov 24*, 234.

Fees charged in Elementary Schools—Return showing Schools in which Fees are charged, Number of Scholars, and Amount of Fee, etc., proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.

History and Geography, Teaching of.
Debate [*Lords*], *Dec. 1*, 813.
Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire, History and Geography of—Importance of a Knowledge of the British Empire as a whole, 813, 821.
Maps, Provision of Up-to-date Maps, Importance of, 818.
Modern Events, Laying greater Stress on Modern and Important Historical Events, 815.
Time devoted to, Inadequacy of—Less time for Grammar and more for History and Geography, proposed, 817, 818.

Ireland.
National School Teachers, *see* that title.
Physical Science and Manual Instruction, Provision for Training of Teachers.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 851.
School Building Grants—Revision of Scale, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1314.
Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners -- Enforcing Decision of Education Commissioners.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1066.
Technical Instruction — Equivalent Grant.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1313.

Jersey—Superannuation Rules for Elementary School Teachers Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1302.

Llangollen National Schools — Children interrogated as to Religious Beliefs of Parents, Treatment of Children of Nonconformists.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 383.

National School Teachers, Ireland, *see* that title.

Religious Instruction.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.

School Teachers' Houses, Grants for 1843-1881—Return Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Scotland—Encouragement of Commercial Education, Removal of Age Restrictions on Certificates, etc.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1064.

Education—*cont.*

Secondary and Technical Education—Minutes sanctioning subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act of 1889, Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Teachers.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.
National School Teachers, Ireland, *see* that title.

Voluntary Schools—Jobbery in Distribution of Special Aid Grant, Charge against Diocesan Boards.
Observations in Debate on the Education Bill, Dec. 2, 959, 965.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary — Sir W. Anson.

Architect—Permission to undertake Outside and Private work.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 20.

Education (England and Wales) Bill
c. com., *Nov. 20*, 31.
Report, * *Nov. 20*, 143.
con., *Nov. 25*, 387; *Nov. 26*, 515; *Nov. 27*, 634; *Nov. 28*, 749.
3R. *Dec. 2*, 926; *Dec. 3*, 1067.
l. 1R. * *Dec. 3*, 1049.
2R. *Dec. 4*, 1190.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Age Limit for Retention of Scholars in Elementary Schools—Pupils over Fifteen, Discretionary Powers of Local Authorities—Redrafting Clause 23, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 631.

Amendments without Notice, Objections to.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 633.

Church of England Elementary Schools not under Trust Deeds, Position of.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 835.

Clause 18 [2].—Date of coming into Operation.
Q, *Dec. 3*, 1054.

Closure by Compartments—Limitation of Number of Questions to be put from the Chair, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 29.

Debates—Committee (Commons), *Nov. 20*, 31; *Consideration Stage*, *Nov. 25*, 387; *Nov. 26*, 515; *Nov. 27*, 634; *Nov. 28*, 749: *Third Reading*, *Dec. 2*, 926; *Dec. 3*, 1067; *Second Reading* (Lords), *Dec. 4*, 1190.
Act of 1870, Historic Parallel—Mr. Forster's Proposals for Rate-aid to Voluntary Schools, etc., 981—984, 1006, 1166.
Age Limit for Attendance at Elementary Schools — Rural Districts, Retention of Pupils over Fifteen for Instruction other than Elementary if there was no available Secondary School, 1036, 1111.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Alternative Schemes, Absence of, 1143, 1172, 1254.
  - Amendments closured, 479, 483, 727, 731, 735, 739, 795, 799, 803, 805, 807, 809, 811.
  - Appeal.
    - Bishop of the Diocese, Appeal to, *see* subheading Bishop.
    - Board of Education, Appeal to.
      - Education Committee, Constitution of—Abolition of Appeal, 760.
      - Local Education Authority superseded by the Appeal to Board of Education, 1088, 1091, 1092.
  - Bishop of the Diocese.
    - Appeal to the Bishop.
      - Dismissal of Teachers, 57–67.
      - Religious Instruction, Question of, 663, 667, 670, 671, 681, 687, 693, 703, 709, 712, 716, 1107, 1232.
    - Powers of—Ramifications of Ecclesiastical Control, 944, 1078.
  - Board of Education.
    - Appeal, *see* that subheading.
    - Attitude towards the Local Education Authorities, 1037.
    - Control of the Board of Education, Nature of, 1083.
  - Centralising Bill, alleged, 1095.
  - Church and Education.
    - Bargain between the Church and the Government, alleged, 75, 85, 89, 90, 105, 108, 645, 1077, 1151, 1206, 1219, 1272, 1282.
    - Burden upon Subscribers to Church Schools — Double Burden of Rates and Subscriptions, 1220, 1222, 1225.
    - Clerical Control—Bill practically an endowment of wealth, influence, and patronage for the Church, 1155, 1279.
    - Financial Contribution of the Church to Elementary Education—Value of School Buildings, etc., 1153.
    - Rate-aid Question, Change of front on the part of the Church during the last ten years, 583.
    - Unfitness of the Church to control Religious Instruction, Differences in Teaching, Insubordination of the Clergy, etc., 1226, 1227.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Church and Education—*cont.*
    - Work of the Church for Education—Sacrifices made by the Clergy, etc., 1098, 1154, 1222, 1224, 1253, 1270, 1277.
    - (Refer also to subheading Religious Instruction, Kenyon-Slaney Clause, etc.)
  - Clause 5, Omission of, proposed, 485.
  - Clause closured, 127.
  - Closure by Compartments, Protest against, 1129.
  - Cockerton Judgment — Legislation rendered imperatively necessary by the Cockerton Judgment, 1195, 1196.
  - Commercial Transaction it was not, but a Bill designed to promote the cause of Education, 105.
  - Committee Stage—Education Bill had occupied more time in Committee than any measure ever submitted to Parliament, 1191.
  - Control, *see* subheading Popular Control.
  - Co-ordination of the different forms of Education, 1082, 1110, 1171, 1221, 1279, 1280.
    - Failure of the Bill to provide a "Ladder" of Learning for Scholars of average capacity, alleged, 938, 973.
    - Line drawn between Primary and Secondary Education, alleged, 940.
    - United States—Results obtained in New York, etc., 1244.
  - County Councils and Municipal Corporations.
    - Attitude of—Power to administer the Bill, Over-work, etc., 752, 757, 759, 962, 1026, 1069, 1095, 1213, 1261, 1266.
    - Democratically Elected Authorities, alleged—Franchise and Distribution of Seats far from Democratic, 963, 1214.
    - Religious Controversy, Danger of introducing, into Local Administration, 1118, 1174.
  - Cowper-Temple Clause, *see* subheading Religious Instruction.
  - Debates on the Bill, Prolonged Nature of—Increase in length of Bill, etc., 1018, 1041, 1090, 1191.
  - Education Committee.
    - Constitution of, 1083.
      - Boroughs and Urban Districts, Majority of Members of the Committee to be also elected Members of the Council, 773.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Education Committee—*cont.*
Constitution of—*cont.*
Majority of Members to consist of Members of the Council, 749, 755.
Overworking Local Authorities, Danger of, 752, 757, 759, 1213.
Co-optation of Members—Nomination of Experts by other Bodies, 761, 780, 1087, 1088, 1104, 1263.
Board of Education, Position of, 760, 776.
County Councils, Attitude of, 758, 765, 768, 770.
Discretionary Power for Local Education Authority as to Right of Nomination by Outside Bodies, 775–784.
Number of Co-opted Members to be less than half the total number of Members, 749–772.
Position of Co-opted Members, 753, 754, 758, 762, 769.
Rejection of Nominees, Powers of Local Education Authority — Position of Body having Right of Nomination, 767, 777, 779.
Removal of Co-opted Members, Possibility of, 769.
Delegation to the Education Committee by the Local Education Authority of such of its powers as it thinks fit, 751, 753, 756.
Disqualification of certain Members from Voting on Questions relating to Salary, etc., in any School aided, provided, or maintained by the Local Education Authority, 788.
Financial Dependence on the Local Education Authority, 953.
Popular Control weakened by Constitution, etc., of the Education Committee, 937, 952, 1087, 1103.
Roman Catholics, Representation of, 1233.
Schemes to be made by the Local Education Authority, 767, 1087.
Consent of the County Council to be required for constitution of either a separate Education Committee or a Joint Committee for any Area within the County, 790.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Education Committee—*cont.*
Schemes to be made, etc.—*cont.*
Co-ordination of all forms of Education to be considered before approving any Scheme, 792.
Duration of Schemes, 769, 771.
London County Council Illustration, 766.
Objections to pushing through Schemes before County Councils with a mandate came into existence, 762.
Provisional Order Procedure, Protest against, 792.
Sectarian Element, Introduction of—Objections to any section of Members being regarded as fighting the battles of Extraneous Bodies, 764, 765, 770, 778.
Term of Office, 1263.
Women, Inclusion among Co-opted Members, 751, 1255.
Education and Religious Politics, Proportion of either to be found in the Bill, 1283.
EducationalSystem—ExistingSystem, Defects of Existing System, 1032, 1033, 1081, 8033.
School Boards, *see* that subheading.
Educational System under the Bill-1034.
Subjects included in Elementary Education were ill assorted and calculated to unfit the Scholars for their position in after life, 927, 930, 938.
(*see* also subheading Co-ordination.)
Elementary Education Proposals, Omission of, 485.
Endowments.
Endowment dependent on any Qualification of the Managers, Qualification of Foundation Managers only to be regarded, 68.
Need for Private Aid and Endowments, Example of America, etc., 1248.
Evening Schools giving Elementary Education, Abolition of, 1035.
Fees, Continuance of.
Apportionment of School Fees between the Local Education Authority and the Managers, 71–97.
Parents who paid Fees were Subscribers, alleged — Equal Rights with other Subscribers of electing Managers, etc., 83.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
  Fees, Continuance of—*cont.*
    Parish or Parishes served by the School, Crediting with School Fees in relief of Local Rates, 97–110.
    Repair of School Buildings, Application of School Fees by the Managers, 73, 74, 87, 88, 91, 99, 389, 391.
    Schools where Fees continue to be charged to cease to be reckoned Public Elementary Schools, 387–398.
  Finance of the Bill.
    Agricultural Rating Act, Grants under—Payment to Local Education Authority and not to particular School Board Districts, 933, 934.
    Amount of Money to be provided, Burden on the Ratepayer, Haphazard way in which Parliament had treated Educational Finance, Solution of the Difficulty, etc., 927, 930, 931, 954, 969, 1218.
    Changes made in System of 1870—Unnecessary changes, alleged, 1293, 1296.
    Church Contribution to Elementary Education—Value of School Buildings, etc., 1153, 1256.
    Cost of Education under the Bill, Increase in, 1294, 1295.
    Expenses and Borrowing Clauses—Recommittal, proposed, 926.
    Rates.
      Effect of the Bill in School Board Districts and Voluntary School Districts, respectively, 933.
      Levelling down Provided Schools to the level of the Voluntary Schools, 941.
      Secondary Education, Rate for—Question of Compulsory Rate, 1299, 1300.
      Variation of Rates between Parish and Parish, Injustice of, 961.
    Roman Catholic Schools, Position of, 986.
    School Board Liabilities other than in respect of Buildings, Provision for meeting Current Liabilities, 933, 934.
  General Election—Probable effect of the Bill on the next Election, 1235.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
  Health of Children — Precautions needed against Overwork, etc., 1255.
  Higher Education, *see* sub-heading Secondary Education.
  House of Lords and the Bill.
    Financial Clauses, Question of Privilege, *see* title Money Bills, etc.
    Inadequacy of Opportunity for considering the Bill, Responsibility of the Government, etc., 1190, 1208, 1209.
  Inspection of Schools.
    Local Authority, Inspection by—Danger of difference between Local and Government Inspectors, 1274, 1275, 1284, 1295.
    Power of the Inspector, 1269.
    Religious Teaching, Effect on.
      Making Religion a matter of Examination, 1226.
      Visitational Authority required to deal with Irregular Practices, 692, 715.
  Institution Schools—Option of Local Authority to take over and maintain such Schools, 117–123.
  Kenyon-Slaney Clause, *see* sub-heading Religious Instruction.
  Local Education Authority.
    Delegation to the Education Committee of such of its Powers as it thinks fit, 751, 753, 756.
    Position and Powers of, 952, 1200, 1201, 1260, 1262, 1273, 1284, 1292.
      Control of Secular Education—Omission of word "Secular" so as to give a general power over all instruction, 515–528.
      Marine or Institution Schools—Option of Local Authority to take over and maintain such Schools, 117–123.
      Secondary Education, Powers as to, 1201.
    Separate Election and Separate Franchise, 1046.
    Single Authority Proposal—Multiplication of Control, Possibility of Overlapping, etc., 942, 947, 957, 958, 1001, 1025, 1033, 1047, 1068, 1163, 1198, 1199.
  Maintenance and Efficiency of Elementary Schools, 1082, 1202.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Management of Voluntary Schools.
    - Appointment of Managers.
      - Board of Education in making an Order to have regard to the Principles on which the Education given in the School had been conducted in the past—Omission of Section, proposed, 31-44.
      - Denominational, School not to be treated as, if it could not be shown to have received a Denominational Character from those who established it. 47-52.
    - Criticism of Principles of the Bill, 1215.
    - Endowments dependent on any Qualification of Managers, Qualification of Foundation Managers only to be considered, 68.
    - Parents who paid Fees were Subscribers, alleged — Voice in the Management, 81, 82, 83.
    - Popular Control, Question of, 1089-1095, 1128, 1272, 1273, 1284.
      - Increase in — Four Representative Managers and two Foundation Managers, proposed, 565, 590.
      - Roman Catholic Schools, Position of, 587.
    - Teachers, Appointment and Dismissal, 1286 — Power for Managers, proposed, 54-68.
  - *Mandamus* — Remedy provided in case of failure in duty on the part of the Local Education Authority, 941.
  - Mandate, Question of.
    - General Election of 1900, References to, 948, 977, 1125, 1238, 1243, 1291.
    - Revolt in Parliament, Constitutional Question, etc., 1238-1241, 1242.
  - Marine Schools—Option of Local Education Authority to take over and maintain such Schools, 117-123.
  - Municipalisation of Education, 1125, 1242.
  - National System of Education and Denominational System, Bill an attempt to reconcile two things which were incompatible, 936, 946, 968, 995, 1204.
  - Nonconformist Grievances.
    - Bill did not remedy Nonconformist Grievances, alleged, 974, 1010, 1227, 1228, 1235, 1242.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Nonconformist Grievances—*cont.*
    - Rates, Expressed Intention of Nonconformists to refuse payment, 1014.
    - Religious Instruction Grievance, 1004, 1011, 1137, 1230, 1270.
    - Sectarian Schools, Facilities for erection and enlargement, 1011.
    - Teachers, Training of, Positions in Schools, etc., 596, 1010; 1082, 1164, 1177, 1207.
  - Nonconformity, Attack on, by the Bill, 1007, 1008, 1038.
  - Opposition to the Bill, 994, 1026, 1123, 1179, 1216, 1250.
    - Absence of Reference to Facts —Statement by Dr. Clifford, alleged, 1133, 1150.
    - By-Elections—Decrease in Conservative Poll, 979.
    - Municipal Elections, Results of, 1114.
    - Nonconformist Agitation, 990, 1207, 1216, 1219, 1227, 1228, 1241, 1298.
    - Welsh Members' Opposition, 1200
  - Origin of the Bill—Voluntary Schools claim for support, Church Party Demand, etc., 950, 981, 1127.
  - Parents who paid Fees were Subscribers, alleged—Voice in the Management, proposed, 81, 82, 83.
  - Partial Legislation, Temptations and Drawbacks of, 1196, 1197.
  - Party Interests preferred by Government before those of Education, alleged, 1237.
  - Popular Control.
    - Criticism of the Control granted by the Bill and of the Machinery by which it was carried out, 937, 974, 1002, 1023, 1085, 1163, 1214, 1230, 1262.
    - Expenditure, Popular Control in relation to, 969, 1262.
    - Reality of, 952, 971, 1103, 1200, 1274.
  - Popular Interest in Education, Absence of, Causes, etc., 1030, 1084, 1090, 1247.
  - Popularity of the Bill, alleged, 972, 978, 1090, 1114.
  - Previous Legislative Attempts of the Government, Review of, 1192—1195.
  - Promise and Performance of the Bill, 1020, 1025.
  - Religious Controversy, Introduction into Local Administration, 1118, 1174.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Religious Instruction, 1042.
    - Appeal to the Bishop, 663, 667, 670, 671, 681, 687, 693, 703, 709, 712, 1107, 1282.
    - Attitude of the Country, Failure of Mr. Chamberlain's attempt to institute Education without Religious Instruction, 1221.
    - Backwardness of the Educational System of the Country owing to the Religious Element, 1115, 1131.
    - Church.
      - Teaching—What was it that the Church desired should be taught? 1121.
      - Unfitness to Control Religious Instruction — Differences in Church Teaching, etc., 1226, 1227.
    - Colonial System, an Alternative to the Denominational System, 1133, 1166.
    - Cowper-Temple Clause.
      - Abolition of—Objections to Limitation of Popular Control, 435, 1298.
      - Compromise between pure Secularism and pure Denominationalism, 525.
      - Demand for, 1230, 1235
      - Extension of to all Elementary Schools alike—Omission of word "Secular" from definition of Control exercised by the Local Education Authority, 515–528.
    - Difficulty, a Newspaper Difficulty, alleged, 1253, 1285.
    - Hour of Religious Instruction. Restricting to last Half-hour of the School Meeting, 473.
    - Injustice of insisting on Dogmatic Teaching in Rate-aided Schools, 517, 522, 523.
    - Kenyon-Slaney Clause—Religious Instruction to be in accordance with the Tenour of the Trust Deeds and to be under Control of the Managers, 1005, 1009, 1072, 1078, 1093, 1113, 1144, 1217
      - Appeal to the Bishop, 663, 667, 670, 671, 681, 687, 693, 703, 709, 712, 716, 1107.
      - Attitude of the Clergy, 676.
      - Bigotry, Danger of, 654, 658, 660.
      - Clergy, Right of, to enter Schools and give Religious Instruction, 681.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Religious Instruction—*cont.*
    - Kenyon-Slaney Clause—*cont.*
      - Insult to the Church of England, alleged — Energy and Self-Sacrifice of the Clergy in the past, 652, 658, 659, 677, 681, 682, 702, 1039, 1079, 1274.
      - Interpretation of the Clause—Intention of those who advocated it and meaning attributed to it by those who opposed it—Third Construction suggested as an afterthought 662, 665-668, 670. 673, 678, 690, 695, 705, 707, 716, 718, 1011, 1012, 1020, 1022, 1040, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1137, 1155, 1168.
      - Omission of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, proposed, 651.
      - Parents, Indirect Representation of, by associating Board of Management with the clergyman, 669.
      - Roman Catholic Position, 672, 684, 698, 717, 987.
      - Slackening of Educational zeal in the future, Introduction of Denominational Friction, etc., 654, 657, 659, 697.
      - Tenour, Interpretation of, 656, 666, 687, 699, 1079.
      - Trust Deeds, Interference with, 661, 662, 692, 701, 710, 713.
      - Visitational Authority required to deal with Irregular Practices, 692, 715.
    - Materialistic Tendencies could not be arrested by Denominational Teaching, 1000, 1149.
    - Neglect of, in Voluntary Schools, 1226.
    - Nonconformist Grievances, 1004, 1010, 1137, 1230, 1270.
    - "Nonconformist Religion," Misconception as to, 1013.
    - Romanizing Literature in the Church of England, 1006.
    - Scottish System an alternative to the Denominational System, 414, 415, 1099, 1113, 1166, 1174.
    - Separate Facilities—Right of Parents to withhold Children during time set apart for Religious Instruction, Right of having Separate Instruction within the School, 401-446.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Religious Instruction—*cont.*
    - Separate Facilities—*cont.*
      - Balfour, Mr. A. J., abstaining from Voting on the Cecil Proposal, 421, 423, 424, 437, 445, 446.
      - Birmingham Experiment, Failure of, 413, 420, 421, 432, 1221.
      - Disorganisation of the Schools, Interference with Discipline, etc., 410, 422.
      - Evils of segregating Children in different Religious Camps, 411, 417, 439.
      - London School Board—Mr. Athelstan Riley's attempt to modify the Religious Instruction Syllabus, 422, 515,
      - Religious Difficulty non-existent in the Schools owing to the good sense and good faith of the Teachers, 411, 425.
      - School Boards, Mistake of assuming that all School Boards were necessarily Nonconformist, 444.
      - Single School Areas, Position of, 404, 433.
      - Teachers of the School—Separate Instruction to be given by the Teachers and not by Outsiders, 427.
      - Teachers, Weakening Position of, 410, 430, 431.
      - Wales—Facilities would be used as a weapon to destroy one system or the other, 438.
    - Single School Areas, *see* that sub-heading.
    - Unsectarian Religious Instruction, Objections to—Tendency towards Indifferentism, etc., 523, 527, 992, 1127.
    - Unsectarian Religious Instruction together with Separate Facilities, 975.
    - Voluntary Arrangements for giving Religious Instruction acceptable to the Parents, 555, 556.
  - Religious Tests for Teachers, 1231.
    - Abolition of Religious Tests for all Grades of Teachers, 599–606.
    - Denominationalism impossible without such Tests, 1243, 1271.
    - "No Test applied to Teachers," 1287.
    - Protest against, 1129, 1215, 1228, 1238, 1285, 1289, 1290.
    - Public Schools, Example of, 1249.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Roman Catholic Schools, Position of.
    - Kenyon-Slaney Amendment—Managerial Control of Religious Instruction, etc., 672, 684, 698, 717, 987, 1231.
    - Managers, Appointment of, Four Representative and Two Foundation Managers, proposed, 587.
    - Nonconformist Attitude towards Roman Catholic Schools, 1014.
    - Powers of Managers, Financial Position, etc., under the Bill, 985, 1231.
    - Single School Areas, Proposal to exempt such Areas from operation of Management of Schools Clause—Position of Roman Catholic Schools, 539, 554.
  - Schedules closured, 129, 134, 137.
  - School Accommodation.
    - Nonconformist Grievance, 1012, 1330.
    - Provision of New School, Removal of Nonconformist Grievance, etc., 1201, 1202.
      - Ingenious Scheme under the Bill for fastening Denominationalism upon National Education, 1074, 1204.
      - Popular Control, Question of, 1094, 1102.
  - School Boards.
    - Churchmen and Nonconformists, Relative percentage, 586.
    - Destruction of—Efficiency of Work, etc., 939, 946, 960, 996, 1022, 1140, 1161, 1213, 1216, 1226, 1258, 1281.
    - Retention of, as the Local Education Authority by Resolution of the County Council, or County Borough Council, etc., 465—472.
  - School Buildings.
    - Church not the only donor of Buildings — Treatment of School Board Areas, 1156.
    - Maintenance and Buildings, Relative Cost, 80.
    - Repair of Buildings.
      - Burden of Executing Repairs would bear hardly on many Church Schools, 1102, 1147, 1223, 1233, 1254.
      - Cost of Repairs, 1021, 1076, 1135, 1153, 1219.
      - Funds—Concession of School Fees, etc., to enable the Managers to meet their Liabilities, 73, 74, 76, 79, 84, 87, 88, 91, 99, 389, 391, 636, 637, 1020, 1038, 1076, 1092.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - School Buildings—*cont.*
    - Transfer to the Local Education Authority either by Payment of Rent or by Purchase, 449–462, 1101.
      - Partial Transfers, Failure of, 458.
      - Private Owners, Position of, 457.
    - Value of—Amount of Church Contribution to Elementary Education, etc., 1153, 1256.
  - Schools transferred from Voluntary Managers to School Boards—Retransference, Application of Sub-Section that in Appointment of Managers the Board of Education should consider the principles upon which the School had been conducted in the past, 41.
  - Secondary Education.
    - Board of Education—Provision that the Local Authority should consult the Board of Education, 1082.
    - Expenditure—Tendency of Local Authorities to be parsimonious rather than generous, 1142.
    - Inadequacy of the Proposals of the Bill, 1024, 1029, 1090, 1210, 1222, 1259.
    - Local Education Authority, Powers of, 1201.
    - Rate for—Question of Compulsory Rate, 1299, 1300.
    - Single Authority Principle, Departure from, 1068.
  - Single Authority Proposal—Multiplication of Control, Possibility of Overlapping, etc., 942, 947, 957, 958, 1001, 1025, 1033, 1047, 1069, 1163, 1198, 1199, 1262.
    - United States—Results obtained under a Single Education Authority in New York, etc., 1244.
  - Single School Areas—Religious Instruction Difficulty, 404, 433, 1229.
    - Appointment of Managers, Compromise proposed—Two Managers to be appointed by the Parish Council. Two by the County Council, and Two by the Denomination, 546, 549.
    - Church Atmosphere—Nonconformist Grievance, 531–533.
    - Confiscation of Schools proposed as a solution of the difficulty, 535, 542.
    - Exemption of Single School Areas from operation of Management of Schools Clause, 529–562.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Single School Areas—*cont.*
    - Parents, Representation of, in Management of Rural Schools, 554.
    - Proselytizing, Danger of, 533, 537, 550.
    - Roman Catholic Schools, Position of, 539, 554.
    - Separate School Remedy, Uselessness of, 548.
  - Switzerland, Educational System compared with that of England, 1115.
  - Teachers.
    - Appointment and Dismissal, 1273.
      - Consent of the Local Education Authority, Omission of "Consent" in order to give the Local Authority the absolute right of Appointment and Dismissal, 593–598.
      - Managers, Power for, proposed, 54–68.
      - National Society's Trust Deed, Appeal to the Bishop of the Diocese or the Arbitrators, 57–67.
    - Dwelling House for the Teacher if any—Payment of Rent by the Local Authority—Omission of Proviso proposed, 634–648.
      - Basis on which Rent was to be charged, 642.
      - County Rate, Application of Rent in relief of, 648.
      - Grants out of which School houses had been built, 641, 643, 647, 961, 967.
      - Repair of Buildings, Objections to Application of Rent for Teachers' Houses to Maintenance of School Buildings, 636, 637.
      - "Shabby" Bargain on the part of the Church, alleged. 635, 638, 640, 641.
      - Trust Deeds, an obstacle to letting Teacher's House, 644, 646.
    - Nonconformist Grievances, 596, 1010, 1082, 1164, 1177.
    - Religious Tests, *see* that sub-heading.
    - Training of Teachers, 1036, 1176, 1250.
    - Voluntary School Teachers, Compensation for Teachers who suffer loss by transfer to the Local Authorities, 1017.
  - Training Colleges—Inadequate and Unsatisfactory Proposals of the Bill, 1211, 1212.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Voluntary Schools.
Buying out the Schools, 950.
Closing Church Schools, Question of, 1291.
Jobbery in Distribution of Special Aid Grant—Charge against the Diocesan Boards, 959, 965.
Poverty of Schools, Strain of depending on Voluntary Subscriptions, Impossibility of Competing with Schools supported out of the Rates, etc., 1070, 1071.
Preservation of the Denominational System, Criticism of the Proposals of the Bill, 948, 949, 956, 989, 997, 1007, 1027, 1117, 1157, 1159, 1165, 1167, 1202–1206, 1264, 1268.
Rate Aid for Voluntary Schools, 1203.
Church — Change of Front during last 10 years, 583.
Forster's, Mr., Proposals, 981–984, 1006, 1166.
Supplement not Supplant — Mr. Forster's Memorandum of Oct. 21, 1869, 981.
Welsh Intermediate Education Act—Abolition of County Governing Bodies constituted by the Act, Transfer of power to the Local Education Authority, 1200.
Women—Inclusion among Members of the Education Committee, 751, 1255.
Working of the Bill, Prospects of, 998, 1225, 1256, 1285, 1297.
"Education," Definition of.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 512.
Finance of the Bill.
Debts and Liabilities of School Boards—Area of Charge.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1312.
Grants to Voluntary Schools earned but not paid previous to taking over by the Local Authority.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 20.
Immediately available Funds of Education Authorities.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 744.
Rate for Salaries—Power of County Councils to levy.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1054.
Total Amount to be voted from Imperial Funds.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 386.
Governors of Secondary Schools—Powers of Local Authorities to appoint.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 847.
House of Lords and the Financial Clauses of the Bill, Question of Privilege, *see* title Money Bills.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont*
Ireland—Amount of Equivalent Grant.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 386.
Local Officials, Eligibility for Membership of Education Authority.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 233.
London.
Date of Introduction of Bill dealing with London.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 250.
Elementary Schools—Amount of Grant payable for first twelve months.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 249.
Proportion of Taxation to be payed by.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 234.
Municipal Corporation Act — Repeal of Section 12, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1315.
Municipal Corporations — Position with regard to Continuous Liabilities.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 744.
Poor Law Children — Local Education Authorities receiving into School free of charge, Provisions of the Bill.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 915.
Religious Instruction—Appeal to the Bishop, Legal Power of the Bishop to assert his position as against his co-managers.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.
Roman Catholic Schools — Amount of Grant.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 30.
School Buildings, Provision free of charge—Managers' Liability for Rates and Taxes.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 234.
Schools transferred by a Denomination to a School Board, Position of.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 631.
Teachers.
Dismissal of Teachers on grounds not connected with Religious Instruction—Consent of Local Education Authority.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 513.
Inclusion under term "Officers" in Schedule 2 (14)—Compensation under Clauses 15 and 16.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 378.
Superannuation Rights, Provisions for safeguarding.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 854.
Transfer of Teachers from School Board Pupil Teacher Centres to Technical and Secondary Schools—Position of, as regards Superannuation.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 835.
Voluntary School Teachers.
Compensation to Teachers not engaged by Local Authorities.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 847.
Security of Tenure, etc.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 500.
Welsh Intermediate Schools, Position of.
Qs. *Nov. 24*, 244; *Nov. 26*, 513.

Electric Lighting Acts Amendments (Scotland) Bill
*c. com.** *Nov. 25*, 491; *Nov. 26*, 607.
Report and 3R.* *Nov. 26*, 607.
l. 1R.* *Dec. 1.* 813.
2R.* *Dec. 4*, 1190.

Electric Railways
Vibration—Carrying out Suggestions of Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 498.

Electrical Engineers
Recognition of Services in the South African War.
Q. Nov. 25, 377.

Elgin
Spirits, Stock in Bond on 31st March, 1901, Total Amount of Spirits Bonded and cleared from Bond from March, 1901 to March, 1902—Return Ordered *Dec. 4*, 1302.

Elibank, Master of [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
Army.
Inniskilling Fusiliers, First Battalion—Date of Return from South Africa, *Nov. 27*, 616, 617.
Officers and the Extra War Gratuity—Exclusion of Officers from participation, *Nov. 27*, 617.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Africa, South.
Martial Law—Commission of Inquiry, Date of Presenting Report to the House, *Nov. 20*, 12,13.
Press Censorship — Removal of Restrictions on Letters and Cablegrams, *Nov. 24*, 238.
Architect of the Education Department—Permission to undertake outside and Private Work, *Nov. 20*, 20.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 39; *con. Nov. 28*, 754; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 993.

Empire Day
Establishment of May 24 as Holiday in State-aided Schools — Instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its Responsibilities, etc., proposed.
Os. Earl of Neath, *Dec. 1*, 813, 819; Marquess of Londonderry, 821.

Employment
Scarcity of Employment, *see* title Unemployed.

"Empress of India," H.M.S.
Gunnery Practice—Low Average of Shooting.
Q. Dec. 4, 1310.

Engineers
Electrical Engineers, Recognition of Services in the South African War.
Q. Nov. 25, 377.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R. *Dec. 2*, 985.
Ireland.
Gold Ornaments in the British Museum, Restoring to Ireland—Date of Trial of Case, *Dec. 4*, 1315.
School Building Grants, Revision of Scale, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1314.
Technical Instruction — Equivalent Grant, *Dec. 4*. 1313.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 40, 50, 59, 63, 64, 66.

Evening Continuation Schools
Grants payable under Section XX. of the Regulations—Increased Payments for increased Efficiency, etc.
Q. Nov. 24, 234.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
c. 3R. *Dec. 1*, 905.
l, 1R.* *Dec. 3*, 1049.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Leonard, Sergeant, Degradation to the Ranks — Public Inquiry, proposed, Dec. 4, 1317, 1318.

Factories
Ventilation of—Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry
Q. Nov. 26, 498.

Fahy, Michael
Fine imposed on, for attack on Dwelling house—Alleged misrepresentations by the Police.
Q. Nov. 26, 511.

Fair Rents, Ireland
see Judicial Rents.

Fanning Island to Vancouver Cable
Speed Trials, Results of Tests.
Q. Dec. 4, 1305.

Fardell, Sir T. G. [Paddington, S.]
Metropolitan Common Poor Fund—Auditing of Accounts, etc., *Nov. 25*, 376.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Aboyne Post Office, Scotland—Compulsory retirement of Miss Moggach from Office of Postmistress, Question of Pension, *Nov. 28*, 745.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Objections to Rule Empowering the Speaker to adjourn the House without Question put, etc., *Dec. 1*, 892.

Farrar, Lord
Free Trade, Definition of.
Os. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 267; Sir W. Harcourt, 273.
Sugar Bounties, Opinion as to Evils of.
Os. Mr. Parker Smith, *Nov. 24*, 293; Mr. J. Reid, 316.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov, 20*, 77, 78, 79; *con. Nov. 25*, 391, 456; *Nov. 27*, 638.
Osborne Estate Bill, 2R. *Nov. 21*, 215.

Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland
Over taxation of Ireland—Opportunity of Protest removed by New Supply Rule, etc.
O. Mr. Hemphill, *Dec. 1*, 887.

Financial Secretary to the Treasury.
Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com· Nov. 20*, 37, 48, 49, 50; *con. Nov. 25*, 467; *Nov. 27*, 645, 646, 647, 659, 660, 661, 663, 664, 666, 681; *Nov. 28*, 772, 775; 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1075, 1076, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1110.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, Religious Instruction.—Appeal to the Bishop—Legal power of the Bishop to assert his position as against his co-manager, *Dec. 1*, 848.
Welsh Intermediate Schools, Position of, *Nov. 24*, 244, 245; *Nov. 26*, 513.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fisher, Mr. Hayes—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Fulham].
Ireland.
Dromod Pier, Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for Construction of Pier, *Dec. 2*, 923.
Sligo to Bundoran, Construction of Railway line proposed, *Nov. 25*, 382.
"Parliamentary Debates," Contract for Printing, Number and Amount of Tenders received, Terms of Messrs. Wyman's Contract, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1062, 1063.
Foreign Prison-made Goods—Total Value of Goods excluded from Great Britain under Act, *Nov. 26*, 509.

Fisheries.
Expenditure in Ireland—Committee to consider authorising of payment (Mr. Wyndham), *Dec. 2*, 926.
Salmon Fisheries Commission Report—Introduction of Bill to carry out Recommendation proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1307.
Solway Fishery Regulations—Assimilation of Bye-laws on both sides of the Solway proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1315.
Trawling, *see* that title.
Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act—Steps taken to make public Provisions of.
Q. Nov. 20, 22.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.
c 2R, *Dec. 1*, 906.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. P. [Wilts, Cricklade.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Transfer of Teachers from School Board Pupil Teacher Centres to Technical and Secondary Schools—Position as regards Superannuation, *Dec. 1*, 835.

Flower, Mr. E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]
Pauper Children, Training of—Utilisation of London County Council Technical Staff, *Nov. 28*, 743.

Foreign Jurisdiction Act
Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State — Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary—Lord Cranborne.

Forster, Mr.
Educational Proposals in 1869 and 1870—Rate Aid to Voluntary Schools.
References to, in Debate on the Education Bill, Dec. 2, 981, 1006.

Foster, Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25*, 432.
Factories, Ventilation of — Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry, *Nov. 26*, 498.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Bridgerule National School, Religious Instruction at—Nonconformist Children withdrawn, Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 2*, 911.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 434; *Nov. 26*, 536.
House of Commons News Room, Alterations in, *Dec. 4*, 1304.

France
Newfoundland — Outstanding questions with Great Britain, Agreement, alleged
Q. *Dec. 2*, 914.
Persia — Commission of Engineers sent from Paris to survey Southern Persia for Railways and Public Works, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 846.
Sugar Bounties.
Abolition of — Delays caused by France, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 254; Mr. J. Reid, 317.
"Cutting Rates" War, Defeat of France.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 24*, 347.

Free Trade
Bounties and Free Trade.
Os. Mr. J. Reid, *Nov. 24*, 317; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 343; Sir R. Reid, 358.
Brussels Sugar Convention and Free Trade.
Os. Sir W. Holland, *Nov. 24*, 298; Mr. Robson, 309; Sir R. Reid, 363.
Conflicting Definitions of.
Os. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 267; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 342.
Countervailing Duties as an Instrument of Free Trade
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 266.
Increase of Trade, Proportionate Increase in Free Trade and Protectionist Countries.
Os. Mr. Robson, *Nov. 24*, 314; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 346.

Fuller, Mr. J. M. F. [Wilts, Westbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 568.

Galway
Canadian Mail Service with Great Britain — Galway as a Transatlantic Port, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1332.

Gambling
Circulars distributed by Post, Making a punishable Offence, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 840.

Gas Poisoning
Dublin, Deaths from Gas Poisoning—Percentage of carburetted water gas supplied.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1332.

General Election of 1900
Education Mandate.
Election Speeches.
O. Mr. W. Long, *Dec. 2*, 948.
South African War, the sole issue on which the Electorate had to decide.
O. Mr. Herbert Samuel, *Dec. 2*, 977.

Geography
Teaching of, in Elementary Schools, Geography of the Colonies and Dependencies, Importance of Provision of up-to-date Maps, etc.
Os. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 813, 818; Marquis of Londonderry, 821.

German Firms
Indian Railway Contracts given to German Firms — Delay in shipping Engines, Penalties.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 148.

Germany
Sugar Bounty paid by, amount of.
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 259.
Trade, Increase in, since Adoption of Protectionist Policy.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 24*, 346.

Gibbs, Mr. Vicary (Herts, St. Albans)
Metropolitan Boroughs Subscriptions to the Association of Municipal Corporations disallowed by Auditors — Decision of Local Government Board, Dec. 4, 1310.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules — Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders —Insufficient Experience of Working of New Rules, etc., Dec. 1, 875, 877.

Gibraltar
Zafarini Islands, Acquisition of by Russia as a Coaling Station, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Gillies, Mr. J. M.
Glasnevin Bee-keeping Lectures, Qualifications of Mr. Gillies for appointment as Lecturer.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 853; *Dec. 4*, 1329, 1330.

Gladstone, Mr. W. E.
Osborne Estates —Cost to the Nation of merging Osborne Estates in the Crown Estates, Mr. Gladstone's dictum in 1873.
O. Mr. Caldwell, *Nov. 21*, 206.
Sugar Bounties and Countervailing Duties, Mr. Gladstone's Views on—Conferences of 1862 and 1881, etc.
Observations in Debate on Sugar Bounties Convention, Nov. 24, 252, 253, 304, 316, 349, 350.

Glasgow
Lawyer witholding damages awarded to his Client—Interlocutor issued by the Sheriff of Glasgow.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 613.

Glasgow Corporation (Water and General Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R*, *Dec. 2*, 909.

Glasgow University
Regulations for Degrees of Science in Public Health — Court Ordinance Presented, *Nov. 20*, 2; *Nov. 21*, 145.

Glasnevin
Bee-keeping, Lectures on—Appointment of Mr. J. M. Gillies as Lecturer and Examiner, Qualifications, etc.
Qs. Dec. 1, 853; *Dec. 4*, 1329, 1330.

Glenville
United Irish League Meeting—Police Interference, alleged.
Qs. Dec. 4, 1313.

Gold Ornaments
Irish Gold Ornaments in the British Museum, Restoring to Ireland—Date of Trial of case.
Q. Dec. 4, 1315.

"Good Hope," H.M.S.
Boarding Pikes, Issue of—Uses of Pikes.
Q. Nov. 20, 16.
Space between Decks, Insufficiency of, alleged.
Q. Nov. 24, 243.

Gordon, Maj. W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1403.
London and Globe Finance Corporation, Liquidation of—Proceedings by Director of Public Prosecutions, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1053.
Penruddocke Cruelty Case—Decision of the Judge, Removal of Mr. Penruddocke's Name from Roll of Magistrates, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 612.

Gore, Mr. Ormsby [Lincoln, Gainsborough]
Argentina,—Murder of Mr. W. Barnett — Steps taken to secure punishment of Murderers, *Nov. 24*, 243; *Dec. 3*, 1056.
"Good Hope," H.M.S., Insufficiency of Space between Decks, alleged, *Nov. 24*, 242, 243.
Isle of Axholme Light Railway—Level Crossing at Haxey, Opposition of the Parish Council, alleged, *Dec, 4*, 1307.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com Nov. 20*. 55; *Nov. 25*, 393, 397 398, 425; *Nov. 26*, 555.

Goschen, Vis.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 4*, 1266.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. (Wilts, Devizes)
Militia Officers, Allotment of Army Commissions placed at disposal of the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, *Nov. 24*, 237.
Workhouse Accounts—Delay in Publication of Committee Report, *Nov. 24*, 230.

Grant, Mr. Corrie [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 20*, 107, 108, 109, 110.
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1336, 1357, 1412, 1418.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, North]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 28*, 765, 782, 787, 789, 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1153.
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1413.

Great Eastern Railway
Intercommunication Apparatus—Provision in Passenger Trains.
Q. Nov. 27, 609.

Great Southern and Western Railway Company
Rates between Limerick and Liverpool.
Q. Nov. 27, 628.

Great Western Railway Accidents
Cardiff, Accident near—Inquiry.
Q. Nov. 21, 147.
Westbourne Park—Result of Inquiry.
Q. Dec. 1, 839.

Greene, Mr. H. D. [Shrewsbury]
Central London Railway — Vibration, Carrying out suggestions of Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Nov. 26, 498.

Greenock
Sugar Refining Industry, Condition of.
O. Mr. James Reid, *Nov. 24*, 315.

Greenwich Hospital
Nautical School, Assistant Masters, Scale of Salaries—Order in Council authorising Alteration in, Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Greenwich Union
Grove Park Workhouse—Local Government Board Loan, Extension of period of repayment, Proposed Deputation to Mr. Long.
Q. Nov. 20, 10.

Greville, Captain R. H. F. [Bradford, E.]
Penruddocke Case—Cruelty to Child, Decision of the Judge, Alteration in Law relating to Penalties to be inflicted for Cruelty to Children, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 612.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Northumberland Artillery Militia—Retention of Headquarters at Berwick-on-Tweed, Camping-ground for Recruits, etc., *Nov. 20*, 12.

Griffiths, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1106, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1153, 1154.

Grimsby and North Sea Steam Trawling Co.
Transfer of Trawlers to Norwegian Flag—*Bona Fides* of Transfers.
Q. Nov. 25, 375.

Grove Park Workhouse
Local Government Board Loan, Extension of period of repayment—Proposed Deputation to Mr. Long.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 10.

Groves, Mr. J. G. [Salford, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 27*, 641, 642.
Income Tax—Exemption of Naval and Military Officers serving Abroad, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 617.

Guiana, British
Indentured Labour—Number of Labourers imported during the last five years.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 16.

Gunnery
Navy, *see* that title.

Guthrie, Mr. W. M. [Tower Hamlets, Bow.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 27*, 701.
Stamp Duties on British Insurance Policies in Sweden—Violation of the Treaty of Upsala, alleged, *Nov. 26*, 495.

Guyot, Mr. Yves
Sugar Bounties, Change of Opinion as to.
O. Mr. J. Reid, *Nov. 24*, 318.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington.]
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1372, 1373, 1374.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R, *Dec. 4*, 1266.
Money Bills and the House of Lords, Financial Clauses of the Education Bill—Question of Privilege, *Dec. 1*, 826, 833.
Voluntary Schools Bill of 1897, Advice given to the House of Lords as to Procedure, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, *Dec. 1*, 826; Earl of Halsbury, 827; Duke of Devonshire, 831.
Patent Law Amendment Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 3.
Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, Commons Amendments, *Nov. 20*, 3.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing.]
Afghanistan, Situation in—Official information as to pretensions of Mahomed Omar Khan, etc., *Dec. 1*, 844.
Army.
Colonels of the Native Army—Promotion to rank of General, Cases of Colonels whose Promotion was stopped under the old System, *Nov. 27*, 621; *Dec. 1*, 844.
Ninth Lancers, Collective Punishment by Government of India for a Crime which has not been proved against them—Details of the Case, Questions of Discipline and of Justice between Natives and Europeans, etc., *Nov. 21*, 189, 197.

Hampton Urban District Council
Bushey Park, Application for land refused—Alleged concession of land by the Office of Works to United Tramways Co.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 1236.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Preston]
Argentine Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for slaughter—Negotiations with the Argentine Government, *Nov. 20*, 20; *Nov. 27*, 624.
Bovine Tuberculosis, Comparisons of Home and Canadian Cattle—Report to the Corporation of Glasgow, *Nov. 20*, 19.
Canadian Cattle imported into Great Britain — Slaughtering at landing ports, Extension of time limit, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 18.
Small Holdings, Number of Owners, and Acreage acquired under provisions of Act of 1892, *Nov. 26*, 505.

Hansard
See "Parliamentary Debates."

Harbours
See Piers and Harbours.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Monmouthshire, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 25*, 423, 424; *Nov. 27*, 637, 704, 705, 706; *Nov. 28*, 768; 3R., *Dec. 2*, 931, 932; *Dec. 3*, 1085, 1103, 1104, 1105.
Education [England and Wales] Bill—Age limit for retention of Scholars in Elementary Schools, Pupils over fifteen, Discretionary Powers of Local Authorities — Redrafting Clause 23, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 632.
Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.
Penal Clause of Convention shutting the "Open Door—Sacrifice of Financial Independence, Position of West Indies, Price of Sugar, Indian Government Attitude, etc., *Nov. 24*, 271, 279, 285, 286, 287.
Russia, Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with (1859) — Steps taken by the British Government to denounce, Effect on the Brussels Sugar Covention, *Dec. 3*, 1058.

Hardie, Mr. J. Keir [Merthyr Tydvil].
Unemployed—Hardships entailed on the Working Classes during times of Trade Depression, Legislation, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 622.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
Artillery, Royal Garrison—Target Practice Seawards, Accommodation on Portguard and Coastguard Ships, Number of Officers taking advantage of, *Nov. 20*, 6.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L.—*cont.*
Navy.
Boarding Pikes, Issue of, to the "Good Hope," *Nov. 20*, 16.
"Canopus," H.M.S.—Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron, State of Boilers, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1320.
Channel Fleet—Statistics of efficient Seamen, *Nov. 20*, [5].
Chatham Barracks, Delay in completion, *Nov. 20*, 6.
China Squadron—Seymour Challenge Cup for good shooting, Position of Ship holding at Parades on Shore, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1321.
Clothing, Rise in price—Fixing uniform price, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1309.
Cruisers.
"County" Class.
Alterations in design, *Dec. 4*, 1319.
Heavier Armaments proposed, *Nov. 20*, 14.
Guns for Cruisers of 13,500 tons displacement, Type of, *Nov. 20*, 15.
Desertions and Discharges—Returns, *Nov. 20*, 6.
"Empress of India," H.M.S.—Low Gunnery Average, *Dec. 4*, 1310.
Rations—Date of introduction of new system, *Nov. 20*, 15.
Seamen—Cost per head of trained seamen, *Nov. 27*, 613.
Norwegian Trawlers in Scottish Waters—Representations to the Norwegian Government, *Nov. 20*, 23.

Harris, Lord
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R., *Dec.* 4, 1299, 1300.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 560.

Hastings Post Office
Searching Pouches of Postmen after each Delivery—Grievance, alleged.
Q. Nov. 20, 7.
"Special Leave"—Written application to the Postmaster, Grievances.
Q. Nov. 20, 7.

Haxey Level Crossing
Construction of, on Isle of Axholme Light Railway, Opposition of the Parish Council, alleged.
Q. Dec. 4, 1307.

Hay, Mr. C. G. [Shoreditch, Hoxton].
Bushey Park—Concession of land to the United Tramways Co., alleged, *Nov. 24*, 236.
Post Office—Scale of Telegraphists' Wages, *Nov. 20.*, 8.

Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale [Devon, Ashburton]
Africa, South—Sending out Families of Soldiers detained in South Africa proposed, *Nov. 25*, 378.
Newton Abbot Postmen, Scales of Pay—Placing Postmen on same scale as those at Torquay and Teignmouth, *Nov. 21*, 147.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 27*, 682, 699, 716, 717; *Nov. 28*, 782.
Newcastle West Union Labourers' Scheme, Local Inquiry, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 914.

Heaton, Mr. J. Henniker [Canterbury]
Army and Navy Reservists in Canterbury Workhouse—Exemption from Stonebreaking, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1,311.

Hebrides.
Mail Service in the Western Hebrides—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in Transit, etc.
Q. Nov. 24, 245.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]
Education (England and Wales) *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 33; *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 473.

Hemphill, Mr. [Tyrone, N.]
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders—Injustice inflicted upon Ireland by Supply Rule, etc., *Dec. 1*, 886.

Hennessy, Robert
Warder at Maryborough Prison—Reasons for transfer of to Mountjoy Prison.
Q. Nov. 20, 28.

Hertford
Census of Areas, Houses and Population, Return Presented, *Dec. 2*, 910; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Het Oosten
Advertisement of Martial Law Notices, Delay in Payment of Account.
Q. Nov. 21, 149.

Highlands and Islands of Scotland
Mail Service in the Western Hebrides—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in Transit, etc.
Q. Nov. 24, 245.

Hill of Down
Road to Ballivor, Condition of.
Q. Nov. 20, 26.

Hillstreet, Roscommon
Postal Service — Sunday Delivery of Letters, proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 848.

History
Teaching of, in Elementary Schools.
Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire—Importance of a Knowledge of the History of the British Empire.
Os. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 813; Marquess of Londonderry, 821.
Modern Events—Necessity for laying greater stress on Modern and Important Historical Events.
O. Earl of Meath, *Dec. 1*, 815.

Hobhouse, Mr. H. [Somerset, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 47; *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 462; *Nov. 26*, 591, 593, 604; *Nov. 28*, 758, 775, 787, 791; 3R., *Dec. 2*, 932, 934.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Debts and Liabilities of School Boards, Area of Charge, *Dec. 4*, 1312.

Hogg, Mr. L. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
Penruddocke Case, Cruelty to Child, Decision of the Judge—Removal of Mr. Penruddocke's Name from Roll of Magistrates, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 612.

Holland
Brined Vegetable Industry—Report Presented, *Nov. 25*, 373, 374.
Coal—Shipments from Great Britain, Decrease in since the imposition of the Coal Duty.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 235.
South African Concentration Camps, Expenditure of Foreign Contributions
Q. *Nov. 21*, 149.

Holland, Sir W. H. (York, W.R., Rotherham)
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Free Trade and the Convention, Position of the West Indies, Loss to Consumers of Sugar, Position of the Colonies, Danger of Tariff War, etc., *Nov. 24*, 297.

Holsworthy, Devonshire
Bridgerule National School, Religious Instruction at—Nonconformist Children withdrawn, Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 911.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Right Hon. A. Akers-Douglas.
Under Secretary—Hon. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.

Hope, Mr. J. Fitzalan [Sheffield, Brightside].
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 395, 396, 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1144, 1150.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Voluntary School Teachers, Provisions for protection of, *Nov. 27*, 633.

Horses
Cruelty to Horse, Case of J. Younger—Further Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 375.
Irish Horse-breeding Experiments—Amount expended by the Congested Districts Board during the last two years.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 627.

Houldsworth, Sir W. [Manchester, N.W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Grants to Voluntary Schools earned but not paid previous to taking over by the Local Authority, *Nov. 20*, 20.

House of Commons
see Parliament.

House of Lords
see titles Money Bills and Parliament.

Howard, Mr. Joseph [Middlesex, Tottenham.]
Australasian Mail Service—Detention of Mails at New York, Delays caused by, *Dec. 4*, 1304.

Hudson, Mr. G. B. [Herts, Hitchin]
Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Extension of Railways, *Nov. 26*, 496.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 593; *Nov. 28*, 775, 785, 788, 789.
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Clause 18 [2]—Date of coming into operation, *Dec. 3*, 1054.
Finance—Power of County Councils to levy Rates for Salaries, *Dec. 3*, 1054.
Welsh Intermediate Schools, Position of, *Nov. 24*, 244, 245; *Nov. 26*, 513.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [York, W. R., Morley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 34, 121; *con. Nov. 25*, 396, 397, 398.

Ice Cream Shops (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill
c. Order for Committee read, Bill withdrawn, *Nov. 20*, 31.

Ichthyological Committee
Report, Date of issue.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 748.

Ilfracombe
Coastguards—Failure to keep proper lookout, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 610.

Income Tax
Naval and Military Officers serving Abroad—Exemption of, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 617.
Public Companies—Revenue Officers requesting information as to Salaries paid to Employées.
Qs. *Nov. 25*, 382; *Dec. 4*, 1324, 1325.

Incorporated Law Society
- Irish Language—Refusal to make Irish an optional subject in Solicitors' Examinations. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 509.

India
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
- *Under Secretary*—Earl Percy.
- Afghanistan and India, *see* Afghanistan
- Army.
  - Instruments for Bands and Articles of Military Dress, Taxation of—Exemption, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 503.
  - Jubaland Military Expedition of 1901—Batta for Indian Troops. *Q.* *Dec. 1*, 838.
  - Lancers, 9th.
    - Drafts sent to India. *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1053.
    - Murder of Native Cook boy at Sialkote, Collective Punishment of Regiment by Government of India for a Crime which had not been proved against Men, etc. *Debate on Financial Statement*, *Nov. 21*, 179.
      - Death of Cook boy not due to Ill-treatment—Doctor's Opinion, 196.
      - Drawbacks of Collective Punishments, 182, 184, 186.
      - Inquiry—Full and Independent Inquiry, proposed, 182.
      - Justice between Natives and Europeans, Question of, 187, 194.
      - Previous Cases of Ill-treatment of Natives, 191, 195.
      - Relations between Natives and British Troops, Effect on, 188.
      - Unreliable Nature of Evidence, 180.
    - Report of Military Authorities, Publication of. *Qs.* *Nov. 26*, 502; *Dec. 3*, 1051.
  - Native Army.
    - Colonels—Promotion to Rank of General, Cases of Colonels whose Promotion was stopped under the old System. *Qs.* *Nov. 25*, 380; *Nov. 27* 621; *Dec. 1*, 844.
    - Housing of Native Troops. *O.* Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 177.
  - Pay of British Soldiers, Increase in—Laying Correspondence on the Table, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 381.

India—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Pensions from Military Funds—Payment of in England, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1050.
- Cable Communication.
  - All British Cable, Construction of Line connecting Cocos, Ceylon and Singapore, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 925.
  - Indo-European-Persian Telegraph Line, Expenditure on, etc. *O.* Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 164.
    - Spur Cable to connect Keeling Islands with Ceylon, proposed. *O.* Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 166.
- Condition of the Country—Causes of Poverty, Official Opposition to Introduction of Private Capital and Enterprise, etc. *O* Col. Denny, *Nov. 21*, 157.
- Coronation of King Edward VII—Cost of Durbar at Delhi, Expenditure to be drawn from the Indian Exchequer. *O.* Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 160.
- Cotton Industry, Crisis in—Relation to Currency changes, etc. *O.* Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 168.
- Currency—Establishment of Gold Standard, etc.
  - Relief to the Revenue obtained at the Expense of the Indian Taxpayer. *O.* Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 171.
  - Revenue and Trade, Effect on. *O.* Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 168, 169.
  - Silver Hoards of the People, Effect in depreciating value of. *O.* Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 173.
- Currency Notes, Exchange Difficulties, etc. *O.* Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 177.
- Curzon, Lord.
  - Extension of Term of Office, proposed. *O.* Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 179.
  - Splendid Services of. *O.* Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 179.
- Education—Need for Technical Instruction, etc. *O.* Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 176.
- Famine.
  - Amount expended in Relief. *O.* Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 163.
  - Causes of—Regular recurrence of Drought, Loss inflicted on Native Population, Irrigation as chief remedy, etc. *O.* Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 152.
  - Remission of Arrears of Rents to Tenants who have suffered in consequence of the Famine. *O.* Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 162.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Famine Commission of 1901, Recommendations of.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 153.
Finance.
Currency, *see* that subheading.
Improvement in Financial Position, Revenue producing Assets of the Government, etc.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 160.
Pensions, Burden of.
O. Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 176.
Revenue Accounts, Complicated Nature of, etc.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 162.
Surpluses of the past three years, Sources of, etc.—Surpluses due to Currency changes rather than to increased Prosperity.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 166.
Indo-European-Persian Telegraph Line, *see* sub-heading Cable Communication.
Indigo Trade, Depression in—German Competition, etc.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 151.
Irrigation Works.
Expenditure on, Revenue produced by, etc.
Os. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 155; Mr. J. Walton, 161.
Famine Commission of 1901, Recommendations of.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 154.
Works on a scale similar to that of the recently constructed Nile Works, proposed—Government neglect of Irrigation in favour of Railways, etc.
Os. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 150, 154, 155; Sir E. Sassoon, 166; Mr. Weir, 177.
Justice, Administration of—Failure of Justice.
Lancers, 9th, Murder of Native Cook Boy at Sialkote—Question of Justice between Natives and British Troops, etc.
O. Capt. Norton, *Nov. 21*, 188.
Sirdar Natu and Krishna Rao Raghunath.
O. Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 178.
Land Revenue Assessment—Indebtedness of Cultivators.
Agricultural Banks as Remedy, etc.
Os. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 153, 154; Mr. Weir, 175.
Evictions, Number of, etc.
O. Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 175.
Officials' Term of Service—Lengthening proposed, Disadvantages of frequent change of Officials.
Os. Col. Denny, *Nov. 21*, 158; Mr. Weir, 176.

India—*cont.*
Opium Trade.
Correspondence between India Office and the Society for Suppression of Opium Trade—Return Ordered, *Nov. 20*, 4—Presented, *Nov. 27*, 609.
Depression in, Causes of.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 151.
Revenue for last three years.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 149.
Persia and India.
Status Quo, Maintenance of in Persia—Importance to Safety of India.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 164, 165.
Trade by the Quetta-Nushki Route etc. — Interference of Russian Medical Officers.
Q. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21* 163.
Population, Increase in.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 152.
Public Works Department — Attitude towards Private Enterprise and Capital, Committee of Inquiry proposed.
O. Col. Denny, *Nov. 21*, 159.
Railways.
Automatic Brakes, Absence of, on Passenger Trains.
O. Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 178.
Contracts given to German Firms—Delay in Shipping Engines, Penalties.
Q. Nov. 21, 148.
Expenditure on, Revenue produced by, etc.
Os. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 154; Mr. J. Walton 161; Sir E. Sassoon, 166; Mr. Weir, 177.
Purchase by Indian Government.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 161.
Receipts, Increase in.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 168.
Rainfall, Abundance in certain Districts, etc.
O. Mr. Wylie, *Nov. 21*, 156.
Salt Tax, Question of Reduction—Injustice of perpetuating Tax imposed to meet exceptional Circumstances, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 162; Sir. E. Sassoon, 165.
Sanitary Measures—Report for 1900-1901 Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.
Silver Ornaments representing Natives Savings—Effect of Currency changes on Sale Price, etc.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 173.
Sugar Bounties, Countervailing Duties against.
Adoption of Principle.
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 254.
Mauritius Sugar Industry, Effect on.
O. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 24*, 283.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Sugar Bounties, etc.—*cont.*
Price of Sugar, Effect on.
O. Mr. P. Smith, *Nov. 24*, 289.
Telegraphic Communication, *see* sub-heading Cable Communication.
Trade—Increase in Export Trade, Causes of Increase, etc.
O. Sir E Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 68.

Industrial Property
Brussels Convention, 1883 — Order in Council Presented, *Dec. 2*, 909, 910.

Inebriate Reformatories
Inspector's Report Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1302.

Infirmaries, Ireland
Expenditure—Instructions to Auditors to Surcharge Illegal Expenditure, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 384.
Roscommon—Inquiry into Management of Union Hospital proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848
Tipperary County Infirmary Committee—Refusal to carry out suggestions of Local Government Board Auditor.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 248.

Inniskilling Fusiliers
First Battalion — Date of return from South Africa.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 616.

Insurance
British Insurance Policies in Sweden, Stamp Duties charged on—Violation of the Treaty of Upsala, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 495.

Inverness
Spirits, Stock in Bond on 21st March, 1901, Total Spirits Bonded and Cleared from Bond from March, 1901, to March, 1902—Return Ordered, *Dec. 4*, 1302.

Ireland
Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary — Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.
Attorney - General — Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Agricultural, Migratory, and other Labourers—Statistics with Report for 1902 Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741, 742.
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see* that title.
Ardglass Labourers' Cottages—Delay in erection.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1329.
Armagh Post Office Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 923.
Athy.
Jurors List—Complaints as to Method of preparation.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 924.

Ireland—*cont.*
Athy—*cont.*
Publican prosecuted by the Police for serving a drunken man—Case of Mr. P. Knowles.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 23.
Bagnalstown Petty Sessions Summonses—Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses in Cases at the suit of the Town Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 625.
Ballymoney and Portrush Post Offices—Amount of business transacted, Provision of new Post Offices, etc.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 29.
Banbridge Petty Sessions—Prosecution of Campbell and Leary by Board of Guardians, Failure to convict.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 626.
Belfast, *see* that title.
Boycotting and Intimidation—Number of Families and Persons boycotted throughout Ireland.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1327.
Buncrana—Carndonagh Railway, *see* that title.
Canadian Mail Service—Galway as a Transatlantic Port, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1332.
Canal Traffic Tolls — Midland Great Western Railway Charges, Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 842.
Civil Service—Boy Copyists Examination Centres, Inclusion of Londonderry, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1049.
Congested Districts Board—for collective heading, *see* title Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Constabulary, Royal Irish, for collective heading, *see* title Constabulary.
Corkly Orange Lodge—Visit to Keady, Discharge of Firearms on the Public Road, Conduct of the Police, etc.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 627.
County Councils.
Electoral Division—Inquiry into Boundaries, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 246.
Union Solicitors, Eligibility for Membership—Position of Poor Law Medical Officers.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 27.
Crimes Act of 1887—Imprisonment of Members of Parliament under, Compulsory performance of Menial tasks, Washing Clothes, etc., alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1330, 1331.
De Freyne Estate—Cost of Extra Police.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 27.
Dingle Licensing Case—Action of the Bench in granting new Licences.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 836.
Dispensary Medical Officers, *see* title Medical Officers.

cont.

Ireland—*cont.*

Dog Poisoning Cases at Ballaghaderreen—Police Report.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Donegal Trunk Telephone Service—Guarantees given to the Post Office.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 745.

Downpatrick — Sunday Demonstrations during Church hours, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 850.

Dromod Pier, Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for construction of Pier.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 923.

Dromore Disturbances—Police Protection for Mr. Russell.
Qs. *Nov. 24*, 248 ; *Nov. 26*, 510.

Dublin *see* that title.

Education—for collective heading, *see* title Education.

Fahy, Michael, Fine imposed for attack on Dwelling house — Misrepresentations by the Police, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 511.

Fisheries, Expenditure — Committee to consider authorising of payment (Mr. Wyndham) *Dec. 2*, 926.

Gas Poisoning, Deaths from, in Dublin—Percentage of Carburetted Water Gas supplied.
Q. *Dec 4*, 1332.

Glasnevin—Lectures on Bee-keeping, Appointment of Mr, J. M. Gillies as Lecturer and Examiner, Qualifications, etc.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 853 ; *Dec. 4*, 1329, 1330.

Glenville, United Irish League Meeting—Police Interference, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1313.

Gold Ornaments in British Museum, Restoring to Ireland—Date of trial of case.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1315.

Grazing Lands, Compulsory Sale and Division of Lands amongst the Population in the Congested Districts, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 247.

Great Southern and Western Railway, *see* that title.

Harbour and Railway Guarantees—Return of Baronies charged with, etc., Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146.

Hill Street Postal Service—Sunday Delivery of Letters, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.

Horse-breeding Experiments—Amount Expended by the Congested Districts Board during the last two years.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 627.

Infirmaries, *see* that title.

Irish Language, *see* that title.

Ireland—*cont.*

Judicial Rents.

Clements, Colonel, Estate in South Leitrim—Fair Rent Application.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 248.

Second-term Rents—Total Amount of Reductions made by the Land Commission during the last Twelve Months.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 26 ; *Dec. 4*, 1327.

Labourers' Cottages—for collective heading *see* title Labourers' Cottages.

Land Commission—for collective heading *see* title Land Commission.

Land Question—for collective heading, *see* title Land Question.

Leitrim, *see* that title.

Lights and Lighthouses—for collective heading, *see* title Lights and Lighthouses.

Limerick — Pilotage, Harbour Commissioner's Bye-laws—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway, *see* that title.

Longford, Boarding-out Dispute—Guardians' Action against Jane Devine.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 626.

Lunatic Asylums in Sligo and Leitrim, Overcrowding in, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 384.

Lynchehaun, Convict, Escape from Maryborough Gaol—Changes made in Prison Staff as a consequence.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 28.

Marine Store Dealers Act, Enforcement in Provincial Towns—Number of Prosecutions, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 26 ; *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Meath—Condition of Road from Hill of Down to Ballivor.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 26.

Medical Officers, *see* that title.

Midland Great Western Railway Canal Traffic Tolls—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 842.

Mohill Workhouse Entertainment—Local Government Board Sanction, Licence for Sale of Liquor, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 25, 26.

National School Teachers, *see* that title.

Newcastle West Union Labourers Scheme—Local Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 914.

Newtown Butler Petty Sessions—Cases tried at Magistrate's Residence instead of in Court, Irregularity of Proceeding.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 851.

Ogilby Estate—Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Qs. *Dec. 4*, 1328, 1329.

O'Keefe v. Walsh—Summing up of the Lord Chief Baron, Laying on the Table, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 911.

Ireland—*cont.*

Phœnix Park Constabulary Depôt—Prevalence of Infectious Diseases, Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 385.

Physical Science and Manual Instruction—Teachers of Needlework required to qualify in, Provision for Training of Teachers.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 851.

Police—for collective heading, *see* title Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Post Office—for collective heading, *see* title Post Office.

Presbyterian Church — Precedence of Moderator of the General Assembly.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 246.

Prisons, *see* that title.

Queen's County—Condition of Road from Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 24.

Railways—for collective heading, *see* title Railways.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Health of Children, Neglect to carry out Recommendations of Inspector, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 510.

Roads—for collective heading, *see* title Roads.

Rock Angus, Lighting of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1331.

Roscommon, *see* that title.

Rural Districts, Telephonic Communication between, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.

Sandford Estate, Purchase by the Congested Districts Board, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 385.

School Building Grants—Revision of Scale proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1314.

Shannon River Development Company—Amount of Subsidy paid to, Discontinuance of Subsidy, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 385.

Sligo, *see* that title.

Supreme Court of Judicature—Rules of Court, Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 20*, 4; *Nov. 21*, 145.

Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners—Enforcing decision of Education Commissioners.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Tallow Police Force—Cost of Extra Police, Area of Charge, etc.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Taxation—Over - Taxation of Ireland, Injustice inflicted by New Supply Rule, etc.
O. Mr. Hemphill, *Dec. 1*, 887.

Ireland—*cont.*

Technical Instruction—Equivalent Grant.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1313.

Telegraph Service, for collective heading, *see* title Telegraph Service.

Tipperary County Infirmary Committee—Refusal to carry out suggestions of Local Government Board Auditor
Q. *Nov. 24*, 248.

Trim Military Barracks, Occupancy of by District Inspector Rogers—Yearly Lodging Allowance made to Inspector Rogers.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Tuns Bank, Lough Foyle—Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1050.

Waterford and Wexford Dispensaries—Vacancies, Date of Filling.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 924.

Workhouses—for collective heading, *see* title Workhouses.

Irish Language

Dictionary of the Irish Language.
Amount paid for preparation of, Progress of the Work, etc.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 512.
Post Offices—Provision of Dictionaries, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 839.

Money Order, Refusal of Postal Authorities to furnish, because names of Payee and Remitter were in Irish.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 508.

Solicitors—Refusal of Incorporated Law Society to make Irish an optional subject in Examinations.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 509.

Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party

Imprisonment of Members under Crimes Act of 1887—Compulsory performance of Menial Tasks, Washing Clothes, etc., alleged.
Q. *Dec.* 4, 1330, 1331.

Leadership — Mr. Redmond's proposed Resignation on Account of the Education Bill.
O. Mr. E. Griffiths, *Dec. 3* (115) 1151.

Irish Presbyterian Church

Moderator of the General Assembly, Precedence of.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 246.

Isle of Axholme Light Railway

Level Crossing at Haxey—Opposition of the Parish Council, alleged.
Q. *Dec.* 4, 1307.

Jamaica

Annual Reports Presented, *Dec. 3*, 1049; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Economic Situation—Condition of Sugar Industry, etc.
Observations in Debate on Sugar Bounties Convention, Nov. 24, 276, 332, 352.

Jameson, Major J. E. [Clare, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 699.

Japan
Anglo-Japanese Agreement—Clauses not made public or known to Parliament.
Q. Nov. 24, 235.

Kobe—Beverages exported during 1900-1901, Nature and Value of.
Qs. Dec. 1, 837 ; *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Jebb, Sir R. [Cambridge University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 698, 699 ; 3R., *Dec. 3*, 1078.

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. A. F.—*Deputy-Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means* [Hanst, N.]
Rulings as Deputy Chairman.
Amendments—London Water Bill.
Amendments in the wrong place, *Dec.* 4, 1335, 1336.
Specific Amendment had been moved and the discussion must be restricted to the particular Amendment — With the consent of the Committee the whole subject could be discussed at once, but it must be understood that no discussion would be allowed at the end of the Amendment, *Dec. 4*, 1357.
Clauses of a Bill subsequent to the one under discussion could not be discussed, *Dec. 4*, 1366.
Irrelevant Observations — London Water Bill, *Dec. 4*, 1407, 1408.
Motion to Report Progress—The Motion was out of order under Standing Order 23, which gave to the Speaker or Chairman the right to decline to accept a Motion if he considered it an abuse of the Rules of the House, *Dec 4*., 1334, 1335.
Quorum of the House, New Procedure Rule—There could be no count out at the Evening Sitting before ten o'clock, but if a Division took place before that hour and Forty Members were not present, the House passed to the next business, *Dec. 4*, 1391, 1392.

Jersey
Elementary School Teachers — Superannuation Rules Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1302.

Jessel, Captain H.M. [St. Pancras, S.]
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1397, 1408.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District.]
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, *Dec. 1*, 882, 884, 894, 897.

Jubaland
Military Expedition of 1901—Batta for Indian Troops.
Q. Dec. 1, 838.

Judicial Rents, Ireland
Clements, Col., Estate in South Leitrim—Applications for Fair Rents.
Q. Nov. 24, 248.

Second-term Rents, Reductions in—Total Amount of Reductions made by the Land Commission during the last twelve months.
Qs. Nov. 20, 26 ; *Dec. 4*, 1327.

Jurors, Ireland
Athy Jurors List—Complaints as to Method of preparation.
Q. Dec. 2, 924.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Navy—Prize Money, 1856-1897, Delay in circulation of Return, *Dec. 4*, 1309.

Keegan, Michael
Swords Borough School Scholarships, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners —Enforcing decision of Education Commissioners.
Q. Dec. 3, 1066.

Kemp, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Heywood]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 27*, 648.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R, *Dec. 2*, 987.

Kennedy, Mr. P. J. [Westmeath, N.]
Canal Traffic Tolls, Ireland—Midland Great Western Railway Charges, Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 1*, 842.

Kensit, Mr. J. A.
Imprisonment of—Reduction of Sentence, Special Circumstances of the Case.
Q. Nov. 27, 623.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Religious Instruction, Appeal to the Bishop—Legal power of the Bishop to assert his position as against his co-managers, *Dec. 1*, 848.
Manuscript Amendments without Notice—Limitation of Practice, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 855.
Sunday Closing, Wales—Effect of Licensing Act of 1902, on, Issue of Explanatory Notice in Welsh, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 18.

Kenyon-Slaney, Colonel W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 672.

Kimber, Mr. H. [Wandsworth]
Afghanistan.
Russia and Afghanistan, Commercial Relations between—Direct Communication between Russian Government and the Amir, alleged, *Dec. 1*, 845.
Situation in, Official Information as to Pretensions of Mahomed Omar Khan, etc., *Dec. 1*, 844.

Kimberley, Earl of
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *Dec. 4*, 1189.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
India — Military Pensions, Payment in England, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1050.
Jubaland Military Expedition of 1901—Batta for Indian Troops, *Dec. 1*, 838.
Port Sanitary Authorities — Application of Provisions of Public Health and Local Government Conferences Act, *Nov. 24*, 230.

King's African Rifles
Somaliland Operations — Names of Battalions ordered for service in Somaliland.
Q. Nov. 24, 244.

Knowles, Mr. P.
Publican at Athy—Prosecution of by the Police for serving a drunken man.
Q. Nov. 20, 23.

Kobe
Beverages exported during 1900-1901, Nature and Value of.
Qs. Dec. 1, 837; *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Krishna Rao Raghunath, Case of
O., Mr. Weir, *Nov. 21*, 178.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Africa, South—Concentration Camps, Expenditure of Foreign Contributions, *Nov. 21*, 149.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R. *Dec. 3*, 1126.
Japan — Anglo - Japanese Agreement, Clauses not made public or known to Parliament, *Nov. 24*, 235.

Labourers, Ireland
Agricultural, Migratory and other Labourers—Statistics with Report for 1902, Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741, 742.

Labourers Cottages, Ireland
Ardglass—Delay in erection of Cottages.
Q. Dec. 4, 1329.
Newcastle West Union Scheme—Local Inquiry, proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 914.

Labourers, (Ireland) Acts
Working of, Complications in—Amendment of Act, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1339.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Africa, South, British Troops in.
Customs Duties — Exemption of Articles imported for use of the British Troops, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 916.
Natal—Permanent Military Headquarters, *Dec. 1*, 843.
Pay and Allowances, *Dec. 4*, 1316.
Agricultural Parcels Post, Establishment of, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1326.
Army Corps—Effective Strength of First, Second and Third Army Corps, *Nov. 25*, 379.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25*, 428; *Nov. 26*, 545, 593.
Indian Army—Increase in Pay of British Soldiers—Laying Correspondence on the Table, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 381.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules.
Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Postponement, proposed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 888.
Hour of Meeting of the House, Discussion of, *Nov. 26*, 514.
Prison-made Goods Act—Total Value of Foreign Goods excluded from Great Britain under, *Nov. 26*, 509.
Shanghai, Date of Withdrawal of International Troops, *Nov. 25*, 381.
Small Holdings, Number of Owners and Acreage acquired under provisions of Act of 1892, *Nov. 26*, 505.

Land Commission, Ireland
Judicial Rents.
Clements, Col., Estate in South Leitrim, Fair Rent Applications.
Q. Nov. 24, 248.
Second-term Rent Reductions, Total Amount of during the last twelve months.
Qs. Nov. 20, 26; *Dec. 4*, 1327.
Ogilby Estate—Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Qs. Dec. 4, 1328, 1329.
Proceedings—Return Presented, *Nov. 28* 741, 742.
Sandford Estate, Purchase of by the Congested Districts Board, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 385.

Land Question, Ireland
Conference between Landlords and Tenants, proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 925.
Grazing Lands, Compulsory Sale and division of lands amongst the Population in the Congested Districts, proposed.
Q. Nov. 24, 247.
Settlement of—Conference between the Government and the Irish Parliamentary Party, proposed.
Q. Nov. 24, 247.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.*

Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for Discussion by House of Lords prior to Ratification, *Nov. 24*, 221.

Law, Mr. A. B.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Glasgow, Blackfriars.]

Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Position of West Indies, Price of Sugar, Subsidiary Interests, etc., *Nov. 24*, 302.

Law Courts

Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland—Rules of Court, Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 20*, 4; *Nov. 21*, 145.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercromby.]

Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Position of West Indies, Possibility of Sugar Beet Cultivation in this country, Sugar Refiners and the Sugar Duty, etc., *Nov. 24*, 321.

Lawson, Mr. J. Grant—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [York, N.R., Thirsk]

Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, *Dec. 1*, 893, 898.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]

Lancers, 9th.

Drafts sent to India, *Dec. 3*, 1053.

Murder of Native Cook Boy at Sialkote.

Collective Punishment of Regiment by Government of India for a Crime not proved against them—Inquiry into Case, proposed, *Nov. 21* 179.

Report from Commanding Officer, *Dec. 3*, 1051.

Leitrim

Clement's, Col., Estate in South Leitrim—Fair Rent Applications.
Q. Nov. 24, 248.

Lunatic Asylum, Overcrowding, alleged.
Q. Nov. 25, 384.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]

Cattle and Live Stock.

Bovine Tuberculosis, Comparisons of Home and Canadian Cattle—Report to the Corporation of Glasgow, *Nov. 20*, 19.

Canadian Cattle imported to Great Britain—Slaughtering at Landing Ports, Extension of time limit, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 18.

South African War—Recognition of Services of Electrical Engineers, *Nov. 25*, 377.

Leonard, Sergeant

Degradation to the Ranks for writing to the Secretary of State for War—Public Inquiry proposed.
Qs. Nov. 26, 501; *Dec. 4*, 1317.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Local Officials, Eligibility for Membership of Education Authority, *Nov. 24*, 233.

Lewis, Island of

Barvas Medical Officer's Report, Non-publication of.
Q. Nov. 27, 624.

Broad Bay, *see* that title.

Burying Grounds, Provision of, in the Stornoway District.
Q. Nov. 20, 21.

Cottars and Crofters, Report on Social Condition of—Provision of Holdings, Utilising Deer Forests, proposed.
Qs. Dec. 2, 921; *Dec. 3*, 1063, 1064.

Holm, Loch, Construction of Dry Dock at—Petition for Grant from the Congested Districts Board.
Q. Dec. 1, 838.

Sanitary Condition.

Fevers, Prevalence of—Visit of Local Government Board Medical Officer, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 374.

Local Government Inspector's Report.
Q. Dec. 1, 837.

Tolsta—Outbreak of Typhus, Steps taken to prevent Spread of.
Qs. Nov. 20, 22; *Dec. 3*, 1065.

Shader, Landing place—Delay in Construction of.
Q. Nov. 27, 625.

Stornoway, *see* that title.

Tom-an-Fhuadain, Absence of pathway to the School—Grant-in-Aid, proposed.
Q. Nov. 20, 20.

Trades and Handicrafts, Teaching of—Recommendations of Crofters' Commission.
Q. Dec. 3, 1064.

Water Supply—Provision of Wells with force pumps.
Q. Dec. 4, 1303.

Lewis, Mr. Herbert [Flint Boroughs]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com Nov. 20*, 48, 122; *con. Nov. 26*, 561.

Transvaal Liquor Ordinance—Date of Publication of Text, *Nov. 28*, 746.

Liberal Party

Sugar Bounties, Attitude towards, in the past—Conferences of 1862, 1881, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 252, 260; Sir W. Harcourt, 272.

Liberia
Kroo Boys sjamboked overboard on the "Olenda," alleged.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 5.

Light Railways
Isle of Axholme Railway—Level Crossing at Haxey, Opposition of the Parish Council, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1307.

Lights and Lighthouses
Bilbao Harbour Lights—Defective System of Lighting, Representations to the Spanish Government.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 615,
Ireland
Admiralty List, Inaccuracy of descriptions, Revision and Correction of lists, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 620.
Changes in certain Lights, Rectification of Errors—Lieut. Webster's Communications to the Commissioners.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 747.
Rock Angus, Lighting of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1331.
Tuns Bank, Lough Foyle—Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1050.
Tuimpan Head—Illegal Trawling in Broad Bay detected by Lighthouse Keeper, Extension of System to other Lighthouses on the Scottish Coast.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 624.
Wireless Telegraphy, Adopting as a means of Communication with the Shore, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 912.

Limerick
Pilotage, Harbour Commissioners' Bye-Laws—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws
Ireland
Granting new Licences, Action of the Bench—Dingle Licensing Case.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 836.
Serving a drunken Person — Athy Publican prosecuted by the Police, Case of Mr. P. Knowles.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 23.
Scotland.
Barmaids, Number employed—Date of Issue of Return.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 748.
Spirits, Stock in Bond on 31st March, 1901, Total Spirits Bonded and cleared from Bond from March, 1901, to March, 1902—Return Ordered, *Dec. 4*, 1302.
Sunday Closing, Wales, *see* Wales.

Liverpool
Post Office.
Promotions—Claims of Telegraphists to Postmasterships, etc.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 231.
Ranelagh Place—Insanitary condition of, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 231.
Women Assistant Supervisors—Salary Grievance.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 839.

Liverpool, Bishop of
High Church Revival Extremists, Policy of Episcopal Excommunication — Bishop's Address to Clergy.
O. Col. Kenyon-Slaney, *Nov. 27*, 675.

Llandaff, Vis.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R, *Dec. 4*, 1230.

Llangollen
National Schools—Children interrogated as to Religious Beliefs of Parents. Treatment of Children of Nonconformists.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 383.

Llewellyn, Mr. E. H. [Somerset, N.]
Army—Officers serving in South Africa, Increase of Allowances, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 619.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 20*, 41, 81, 82; *con.* *Nov. 25*, 392, 394, 436, 437, 438, 442, 461; *Nov. 26*, 543, 554; *Nov. 27*, 640, 642; *Nov. 28*, 763, 788, 789, 792; 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1112, 1116.

Local Authorities
Unemployed—Putting in hand Works of Sanitation and Improvement with a view to providing work, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 621.

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill
c. Order for Committee read and Bill Withdrawn, *Dec. 1*, 905.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. J. Grant-Lawson.
Salaries of Upper Division Officials placed on Inferior Scale to those in Departments presided over by Secretaries of State.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 378.

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
Date of taking.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1333.

Local Government (Scotland) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill Withdrawn, *Dec. 1*, 905.

Local Government (Transfer of Powers) Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading and Bill Withdrawn, *Dec. 1*, 906.

Loch Holm
- Dry Dock, Construction of—Petition for Grant from the Congested Districts Board.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 1*, 838.

London, Bishop of
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, Bishop of London's Interpretation.
  - *O.* Col. Kenyon-Slaney, *Nov. 27*, 673.

London County Council
- Technical Classes—Utilisation of, in Training of Poor Law Children, proposed.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 28*, 743.
- Telephone Charges of the Post Office and National Telephone Company, Discrepancies between — Statement of Chairman of Establishments Committee,
  - *Q.* *Nov. 28*, 746.
- Travelling Expenses of Committee Defrayed out of Public Funds, Objections to.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 382.
- Water Supply—Representation of London County Council on London Water Board, *see* London Water Supply.

London Irish Rifle Volunteers
- Command—Appointment of Service Officer proposed.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1054.

London School Board
- Religious Instruction Syllabus — Mr. Athelstan Riley's attempted modification.
  - *References to, in Debate on the Education Bill, Nov. 25*, 422, 515, 522.

London Water Bill
- *c. com., Dec. 4*, 1333.

London Water Bill
- *Debate on Re-Committal, Dec. 4*, 1334, 1391.
  - Confining Committee to discussion of a particular Alternative Proposal to the General Scheme, alleged, 1338, 1339, 1340.
  - Date of taking—Objections to rushing the Bill through the House at the end of a long and fatiguing Session, 1334, 1367.

London Water Supply
- Controlling Authority, Constitution of Water Board—Government Proposals.
  - *Debate in Committee on London Water Bill re-committed, Dec. 4*, 1333, 1391.

London Water Supply—*cont.*
- Controlling Authority—*cont.*
  - *Debate in Committee—cont.*
    - Appeal in Case of Grievance—Appeal by Deputation to Central Body, proposed, 1355.
    - Arbitration Question, Ability of the Board to deal with, 1373, 1377.
    - Balance of Power between London Within and London Without, 1405, 1406, 1409, 1410, 1417, 1418.
      - Majority on the Board for London Within, 1342, 1378.
    - Basis of Representation—Population and Ratable Value, 1381, 1393, 1398, 1399, 1404, 1409.
    - Central Management of Water Supply, Need for — Water Supply emphatically not a Local Question, 1352, 1353.
    - Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Appointment and Position of, 1346, 1349, 1355.
    - City of London, Representation of, 1392, 1395, 1396.
    - Cost of Scheme—Responsibility resting with London County Council, etc., 1356, 1371, 1380.
    - Details of Constitution — Mr. Long's Amendment, 1337.
    - Duplicate Representation, Objections to, 1351, 1368, 1380.
    - Essex County, Reduction of Representation proposed, 1416.
    - Joint Committee of both Houses —Overruling of first Decision as to Size of Water Board by the Government, etc., 1344, 1350, 1372, 1383, 1385
    - Local Government Board, Control of Water Board, 1345.
    - London County Council.
      - Financial Responsibility, 1356, 1359, 1371, 1380, 1383, 1398.
      - Opinion of London as shown by the last County Council Elections, 1382, 1385, 1386, 1408.
      - Opposition to the Bill caused by those who wish the London County Council to control the Water Supply, alleged, 1365.
      - Recognised Authority for London Water and Sanitation, alleged, 1351, 1361, 1386, 1394.
      - Representation, 1337, 1341, 1343, 1356, 1359, 1364, 1371, 1380,

London Water Supply—*cont.*
- Controlling Authority—*cont.*
  - *Debate in Committee—cont.*
    - Metropolitan Board of Works, Resurrection of, 1345, 1347, 1353, 1406.
    - Metropolitan Boroughs, Representation of, 1338, 1341, 1356, 1358, 1360, 1371, 1374, 1377, 1379, 1383, 1385.
      - Equalisation of Representation, 1398, 1401, 1403, 1404.
      - Grouping of Boroughs, proposed, 1405, 1409, 1411, 1412.
      - Opinions of Borough Councils 1341, 1351, 1358, 1385, 1408.
      - Powers of Councils, 1408.
    - Municipal Trading, Government Scheme an Extension of, 1349.
    - Nature and Extent of Business to be Carried on by the Board, 1348, 1361, 1366, 1367, 1373, 1375, 1376.
    - Number of Members—Objections to size of Board, Question of Board's Capacity to deal with all the Matters that will come before it, etc., 1342, 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348, 1350, 1353, 1354, 1358, 1360, 1361, 1365, 1367, 1373, 1374, 1376, 1379 1381, 1383, 1407, 1410.
    - Outside Areas, Representation of, 1336, 1338, 1341, 1343, 1376, 1378, 1381, 1413.
      - Inadequacy of—Increase proposed, 1415.
      - Opinions of County Councils as to Desirability of Representation, etc. 1344, 1359, 1362.
    - Postponement of Clause Constituting Water Board, proposed, 1355, 1356, 1363, 1367, 1372.
    - Principle of Government Scheme—Representation of all Interests Concerned, 1341, 1371.
    - Provincial Water Supplies. Adminstration of—Failure of Analogy between Circumstances of London and Provincial Cities, 1364 1380, 1386.
    - Recommendations of Royal Commissions, 1343, 1344, 1350, 1359, 1367, 1369, 1375, 1382, 1384, 1410.
    - Rural Districts, Non-Representation of, 1341.
    - Thames as a Source of Supply, 1362.
    - Urban Districts Representation, 1339, 1341, 1343.
      - Inadequacy of, 1347.
      - Powers of District Councils, 1408.
    - Waste of Water, Prevention of, 1376, 1378.
    - Water Companies—Preference for an unwieldy Board as likely to give them better terms, etc., 1347, 1348.
    - Water and Sanitary Authority of London, 1351, 1361, 1386, 1394, 1395, 1396.
    - Westminster, Exceptional Position secured for, 1396, 1400, 1402, 1403

London and Globe Finance Corporation
- Liquidation of—Proceedings by Director of Public Prosecution, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1053.

Londonderry
- Civil Service Examination Centres — Inclusion of Londonderry in list of Centres, proposed. *Q. Dec.* 3, 1049.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*President of the Board of Education.*
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 4*, 1287, 1300.
- Empire Day, Establishment of May 24, as Holiday in State-aided Schools—Instruction in Matters appertaining to the Empire and its responsibilities, etc., proposed, *Dec. 1*, 821.

Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway
- Goods Wagons attached to Passenger Trains—Non-compliance with Regulations as to Automatic Brakes. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 913.
- Station at Londonderry, Condition of—Building new Station proposed. *Q.* *Dec.* 2, 913.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
- Bath Hospital Drainage System—Danger to Monkton Combe Water Supply, Inquiry, *Dec. 3*, 1061.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 28*, 787, 788, ; 3R., *Dec. 2*, 933, 934, 945, 957, 958.
- London County Council—Travelling Expenses of Committee, Objections to defraying out of Public Funds, *Nov. 25*, 382.
- London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1357, 1369, 1373, 1382, 1398, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1409, 1415, 1417, 1418.

[*cont.*

Long, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Unemployed.
Aliens, Immigration of Pauper Aliens adding to the large number of unemployed, *Nov. 27*, 622.
Local Authorities, Putting in hand works of Sanitation and Improvement, with a view to providing Work proposed, *Nov. 27*, 622.

Longford
Pauper Children, Boarding-out Dispute—Guardians' Action against Jane Devine.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 626.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
Army Examination Text-books, Difficulty of obtaining, *Nov. 20*, 13.
Ireland.
Ballymoney and Portrush Post Offices, Amount of Business transacted, Provision of new Post Offices, etc., *Nov. 20*, 29.
County Council Electoral Divisions—Inquiry into Boundaries, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 246.
Lights—Inaccuracy of descriptions in Admiralty List, Revision and Correction of lists, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 620, 621.
Marine Store Dealers, Registration of, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1066.
Sugar Duties, Brussels Convention—Steps taken by the British Government to denounce Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Russia, of 1859—Effect on the Brussels Sugar Convention, *Dec. 4*, 1323.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice of England
Baron Alverstone.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.

Lord President of the Council
Duke of Devonshire.

Lotteries
Circulars distributed by Post—Making a Punishable Offence, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 840.

Lough Foyle
Tuns Bank, Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1050.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
Indentured Labour in the West Indies and British Guiana — Number of Labourers imported during the last five years, *Nov. 20*, 16.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1336, 1337, 1342, 1374, 1398, 1409, 1416, 1418.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Insufficient Experience of Working of New Rules, Reference to a Committee, proposed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 867.
Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.
Bill giving effect to Convention, Date of Introduction, Adequate opportunity for discussion, etc., *Nov. 27*, 630.
British Exports of Confectionery, Benefits derived from Article III., *Dec. 2*, 919, 920.
Sugar Refineries—Number working in Great Britain, Number of Tons of Sugar refined in 1902, 1901, 1891, 1881, and 1871, *Nov. 20*, 17.
Telephone Service.
Irish Rural Districts, Telephonic Communication between, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 848.
Tunbridge Wells Municipal System, Purchase of, by the National Telephone Company — Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk—Local Inquiry proposed, *Dec. 1*, 841, 846.

Lowther, Mr. Claude [Cumberland, Eskdale]
Solway Fishery Regulations—Assimilation of Bye-laws on both sides of the Solway, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1315.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. [Kent, Thanet]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R. *Dec. 2*, 926, 930, 934.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Insufficient Experience of working of New Rules, etc., *Dec 1*, 881, 895.
Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.
Bill giving effect to Convention, Date of Introduction, Adequate opportunity for discussion, etc., *Nov. 27*, 630, 631.
Surtax on Imports, Amount of—Equality of import Duty on Goods throughout the Contracting Countries, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 919.
Translation from French to English, Mistakes in, Provision of revised translation, *Dec. 4*, 1323.
Unemployed — Immigration of Pauper Aliens adding to the large number of Unemployed, *Nov. 27*, 622.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means* [Cumberland, Penrith]
Amendments—Education Bill.
"Exclusive," Insertion of the Word would be really to make confusion—It was perfectly clear that the Local Authority had the right to dismiss, and if "exclusive right" were put in, it would very likely lead to confusion, *Nov. 20*, 55, 56.
It was doubtful whether the Amendment should come under this Clause at all, but if the Member thought it did, there would be no objection to his moving it, *Nov. 20*, 55.

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berks, Abingdon]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 61, 67.

Lucas, Mr. R. [Portsmouth]
China — International situation in the Yang-tsze Valley, Effect on position of Great Britain, *Dec. 4*, 1312.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 68 ; *con. Nov. 26*, 524, 525.

Lunacy
Scotland—Pauper Lunatics in Lunatic Wards of Poorhouses, Rules as to, Presented, *Dec. 2*, 910 ; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Lunatic Asylums, Ireland
Sligo and Leitrim Asylums, Overcrowding alleged.
Q. Nov. 25, 384.

Lynchehaun, Convict
Escape from Maryborough Gaol—Changes made in Prison Staff as a consequence.
Q. Nov. 20, 28.

Lyttelton, Mr. A. [Warwick and Leamington]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 678.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 88 ; *con. Nov. 27*, 686.
Transport Service to South Africa—Names, Tonnage, etc., of Vessels employed, Date of Issue of Return, *Nov. 27*, 619, 620.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. E. [Antrim, S.]
Ireland.
National School Teachers.
Equivalent Grants for results—Basis of Payment, *Dec. 2*, 910.
Salaries—Basis of fixing Consolidated Salaries, *Dec. 1*, 841.
O'Keeffe v. Walsh—Summing up of the Lord Chief Baron, Laying on the Table of the House, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 911.
Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners—Enforcing decision of Education Commissioners, *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Ammunition, Value of Defective and Dangerous Ammunition thrown overboard, *Nov. 24*, 242.

McIver, Sir L. [Edinburgh, W.]
Sugar Bounties—Ratification of the Brussels Convention, etc., *Nov. 24*, 363.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 38.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 62, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 97, 98, 100, 106, 110 ; *con. Nov. 25*, 391, 468 ; *Nov. 26*, 547, 581, 582, 583 ; 3R. *Dec. 2*, 1043 ; *Dec. 3*, 1068, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1153.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Age limit for retention of Scholars in Elementary Schools, Pupils over fifteen, Discretionary Powers of Local Authorities—Re-drafting Clause 23, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 631.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1381, 1382, 1401.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, Ireland
Newtown Butler Petty Sessions—Cases tried at Magistrate's Residence instead of in Court, Irregularity of proceeding.
Q. Dec. 1, 851.

Mail Service
Australasian Service—Delays Caused by Detention of Mails at New York.
Q. Dec. 4, 1304.
Borneo, British—Arrangement with the P. & O. Steamship Company to call at a port in British North Borneo, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 507.
Canadian Mail Service with Great Britain—Galway as a Transatlantic Port, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1332.
Scotland.
Stornoway—Refusal of Messrs. Mac Brayne to convey Goods from Stornoway to Kyle, alleged.
Q. Dec. 3, 1066.
Western Hebrides—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in transit, etc.
Q. Nov. 24, 245.

Mail Ships Bill
c. 2R., *Dec. 1*, 906.

Malcolm, Mr. Ian [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 110 ; *con. Nov. 26*, 542, 543, 553 ; *Nov. 27*, 701.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Closure by Compartments, Limitation of number of Questions to be put from the Chair, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 29, 30.

Mallaig
West Highland Railway to, Condition and working of—Date of Issue of Annual Report.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1326.

Manuscript Amendments
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Objections to Amendments without Notice.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 633.

Limitation of Practice of moving Amendments in Manuscript of which no Notice has been given.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 855.

Maple, Sir J. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
London Water Bill, *com.* *Dec. 4*, 1375, 1403.
Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.
Bounties to the Colonies, proposed, Loss to Working Class Consumers, etc., *Nov. 24*, 319, 320, 321.
Most-Favoured-Nation Clause, Effects on, *Nov. 24*, 267.

Marine Store Dealers' Act
Ireland—Enforcement of Act in provincial Towns, Number of Prosecutions under, etc.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 26; *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Martial Law in South Africa
see Africa, South.

Maryborough Convict Prison
Lynchehaun, Convict, Escape of—Changes made in Prison Staff as a consequence.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 28.

Warders—Transfer of R. Hennessy to Mountjoy Prison.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 28.

Mauritius
Sugar Industry, Effect of Indian Countervailing Duties.
O. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 24*, 283.

Meath, County of
Road from Hill of Down to Ballivor, Condition of.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 26.

Meath, Earl of
Empire Day, Establishment of May 24, as Holiday in State-aided Schools—Instruction in matters appertaining to the Empire and its responsibilities, etc., proposed, *Dec. 1*, 813, 819.

Medals
China Operations of 1900—Issue of clasp for Tientsin, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1314.
South African War.
Colonial Contingents—Number of Medals awarded to Officers.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1056.

Medals—*cont.*
South African War—*cont.*
Queen's Medals and King's Medals Reconsideration of Regulations as to distribution, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 241.
Volunteer Officers — Number of Medals, etc., awarded.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1056.
Volunteer Long Service Medal—Alterations in, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 615.

Medical Officers, Ireland
Dispensary Medical Officers.
Salaries—Inequality in Remuneration of Local Officers and *Locum Tenens.*
Q. *Nov. 26*, 511.
Waterford and Wexford Dispensaries —Date of filling Vacancies.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 924.

Poor Law Medical Officers
Eligibility for Membership of County Councils.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 27.
Holiday Grievance.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 854.
Salaries—Inequality in Remuneration Local Officers and *Locum Tenens.*
Q. *Nov. 26*, 511.

Mediterranean Squadron
Engineer Officers of rank of Inspectors of Machinery—Relative rank of Captain, proposed.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 836; *Dec. 4*, 1318.

"Medusa," H.M.S.
Dürr Boilers, Results of Trials—Total Amount spent on the Vessel.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 15.

Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. [York, W.R., Sowerby]
London Water Bill, *com.* *Dec. 4*, 1367.

Members of Parliament
Irish Members imprisoned under Crimes Act of 1887—Compulsory performance of Menial tasks, Washing Clothes, etc., alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1330, 1331.

Mercantile Marine
Boilers Casualties, Number of Persons killed and injured, etc.—Return Ordered, *Nov. 26*, 493, 494.
Collisions—Rules for Prevention of Collisions by Vessels navigating Lake Windermere, Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217.
Cruisers—Report of Committee Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1301.
Pilotage—Limerick Harbour Commissioners' Bye-laws, Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

cont.

Mercantile Marine *-cont.*
Subsidies, Steamship Subsidies—Report of Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix presented, *Dec. 3*, 1067.
Sugar Carrying Trade—Effect of Ratification of Brussels Convention on.
Q. Dec. 3, 1059.

Meteorological Grant
Committee, Progress in selection of.
Q. Nov. 21, 146.

Metropolitan Boroughs
Subscriptions to the Association of Municipal Corporations disallowed by Auditors — Decision of the Local Government Board.
Q. Dec. 4, 1310.
Water Board for London, Representation on, *see* London Water Supply.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund
Auditing of Accounts, etc.
Q. Nov. 25, 376.

Metropolitan Steam Fishing Co.
Transfer of Trawlers to Norwegian Flag, *Bona Fides* of Transfers.
Q. Nov. 25, 375.

Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. [Stafford, Handsworth.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 28*, 783.
Ichthyological Committee—Date of issue of Report, *Nov. 28*, 747.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 20*, 79; *con., Nov. 25*, 420, 429.

Midland Great Western Railway, Ireland
Canal Traffic Tolls—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 842.

Midleton, Viscount
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 4*, 1251.

Militia
Northumberland Artillery—Retention of Headquarters at Berwick-on-Tweed, Camping ground for Recruits, etc.
Q. Nov. 20, 12.
Officers—Allotment of Commissions placed at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa.
Q. Nov. 24, 237.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill
Date of Second Reading, etc.
Qs. Nov. 25, 377; *Dec. 1*, 843.

Milvain, Mr. T. [Hampstead]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 27*, 700.

Mineral Waters, Manufacture of
Sugar Bounties, Effect of Abolition of.
O. Mr. J. Reid, *Nov. 24*, 318.

Moggach, Miss
Postmistress at Aboyne, Compulsory retirement from Office, Question of Pension.
Q. Nov. 28, 745.

Mohill
Workhouse Entertainment--Local Government Board Sanction, Licence for Sale of Liquor, etc.
Qs. Nov. 20, 25, 26.

Money Bills and Money Clauses in Bills —Powers of the House of Lords, Question of Privilege
Debate on Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, Dec. 1, 823.
Amendments of Substance in Bills dealing with other matters in addition to Money Grants, Competence of the House of Lords to make Amendments, 825, 826, 831, 832.
Ancient Practice of Parliament, Lord Salisbury on, 824, 825.
Education Measures of 1870, 1891, and 1897—Procedure adopted by the House of Lords, 825, 826, 827, 830, 833.
House of Commons unlikely to insist on its privileges when convinced that the Lords' Amendments are intended to improve the Measure in Question, 828, 829.
Irish Poor Law Bill (1838)—Lords' Amendments and Privileges of the House of Commons, 828.
Resolutions of the House of Commons regulating the matter—Resolutions of 1671 and 1678, 823, 831.

Money Orders
Irish Language—Refusal of Postal Authorities to issue Money Order because Names of Payee and Remitter were in Irish.
Q. Nov. 26, 508.

Monmouth, County of
Census—Return of Area, Houses and Population Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Monkswell, Lord
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 4*, 1234, 1242, 1243.

Monkton Combe
Water Supply—Danger caused by System of Drainage at Bath Hospital, Inquiry.
Q. Dec. 3, 1060.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
Navy—Practice Ammunition, Alterations in Gunnery Regulations, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1309.
Nigeria—Aro Expedition, Cost of Purchase and Transport of Battery of 12-pounders, *Nov. 20*, 12.
"Olenda"—Kroo Boys sjamboked overboard by British Seamen, alleged, *Nov. 20*, 5.

Moray Firth
Trawling by British-owned Trawlers under Foreign Flags—Legislation, proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 912.

Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1381.

Morgan, Mr. Lloyd [Carmarthen, W.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Municipal Corporation Act, Repeal of Section, 12, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1315.
- Postmen—Old Age Pensions for Rural and Auxiliary Postmen, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1304.

Moulton, Mr. T. F. [Cornwall Launceston]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 550, 551.

Mowbray, Sir R. G. C. [Lambeth, Brixton]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Teachers Inclusion under term "Officers" in Schedule 3 (14), etc. *Nov. 25*, 378.
- London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1402.

Municipal Corporations, Association of
- Metropolitan Boroughs' Subscriptions disallowed by Auditors—Decision of the Local Government Board.
  Q. Dec. 4, 1310.

Murray, Col. C. W. [Bath]
- Africa, South—Parcels Post, Reduction in Rates, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 914.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Poor Law Children, Local Education Authorities receiving into Schools free of charge, Provisions of the Bill, *Dec. 2*, 915.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]
- Commercial Education in Scotland, Encouragement of—Removal of Age restrictions on Certificates, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1065.
- Fisheries—Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act, Steps taken to make public Provisions of, *Nov. 20*, 22, 23.
- Lewis, Island of.
  - Barvas—Non-publication of Medical Officer's Report, *Nov. 27*, 624.
  - Burying Grounds, Provision of in the Stornoway District, *Nov. 20*, 21.
  - Cottars and Crofters—Provision of Holdings for, Utilising Deer Forests, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1063, 1064.
  - Shader, Landing Place—Delay in Construction of, *Nov. 27*, 625.
  - Tolsta—Outbreak of Typhus, Steps taken to prevent Spread of, *Nov. 20*, 22; *Dec. 3*, 1065.
  - Tom-an-Fhuadain, Absence of pathway to the School—Grant-in-Aid, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 21.
  - Trades and Handicrafts, Teaching of—Recommendations of Crofters' Commission, *Dec. 3*, 1064.
- Local Government (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 905.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*
- Stornoway—Allocation of Sites of Fishermen's Dwellings, *Nov. 20*, 21.
- Trawling—Illegal Trawling.
  - Broad Bay.
    - Frequent Occurrence of Cases—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 26*, 508.
    - Tiumpan Head Lighthouse, Detection of Trawling from—Extension of System to other Lighthouses on the Scottish Coast, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 625.
  - Norwegian Trawlers in Scottish Waters—Representations to the Norwegian Government, *Nov. 20*, 23.
  - Penalties—Increasing the maximum Penalty, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1327.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Dublin Post Office—Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists.
  - Clerical Staff in Accountant's Office—Recruiting from the ranks of Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 232.
  - Performance of Postmen's Duties, Alleged, *Nov. 24*, 232.

Natal
- British Garrison — Permanent Military Headquarters.
  Q. Dec. 1, 843.

National Expenditure
- *see* Revenue and Expenditure.

National School Teachers, Ireland
- Belfast—Payments of Balance of Grade Salary.
  Q. Nov. 26, 509.
- Equivalent Grants for Results—Basis of Payment.
  Q. Dec. 2, 910.
- Salaries — Basis of fixing Consolidated Salaries.
  Q. Dec. 1, 841.
- Teachers of Needlework required to qualify in Physical Science and Manual Instruction, Alleged.
  Q. Dec. 1, 851.

National Telephone Company
- Charges, Comparisons with Post Office Charges—Statement of Chairman of Establishments Committee of the London County Council.
  Q. Nov. 28, 746.
- Tunbridge Wells Municipal Telephone System, Purchase of — Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk—Local Inquiry, proposed.
  Qs. Dec. 1, 841, 846.

Navy
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.
Ammunition.
Defective Ammunition thrown Overboard.
Names of Officials responsible for Manufacture, Examination, Testing, and taking into Stock of defective Ammunition.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 917.
Value of Defective and Dangerous Ammunition thrown Overboard.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 242.
Practice Ammunition.
Alterations in Gunnery Regulations, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1309.
Amount allowed for Heavy Guns.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 379.
Boarding Pikes, Issue of to the "Good Hope"—Uses of Pikes.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 16.
Boilers.
Dürr Boilers — Results of Trial on H.M.S. "Medusa."
Q. *Nov. 20*, 15.
Report on Trials of H.M. Ships, Date of Issue.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 748.
Report Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1301.
Return showing Comparison between Ships with Scotch Boilers and those fitted with Water-tube Boilers, Ordered, *Nov. 24*, 227.
Cadets—Cost of Messing, Number and Character of Meals provided.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1318.
"Canopus," H.M.S. — Recall from the Mediterranean Squadron, State of Boilers, etc.
Qs. *Dec. 4*, 1320, 1321.
Channel Fleet—Statistics of efficient Seamen.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 5.
Chatham Barracks, Delay in completion.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 6.
China Squadron, *see* that title.
Clothing, Rise in price—Fixing uniform price, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1309.
Cruisers.
Armament of.
"County" Class Cruisers — Heavier Armaments, alleged lack of stability of Cruisers.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 14.
Guns for Cruisers of 13,500 tons displacement, Type of.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 15.
"County" Class, Alteration in design.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1319.

Navy—*cont.*
Desertions and Discharges—Returns.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 6.
"Empress of India," H.M.S.—Low Gunnery Average.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1310.
Engineering Branch.
Artificers—Cabin Accommodation for.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1319.
Officers of rank of Inspector of Machinery — Relative rank of Captain, proposed.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 836; *Dec. 4*, 1318.
"Good Hope," H.M.S., *see* that title.
Greenwich Hospital Nautical School, Assistant Masters, Scale of Salaries—Order in Council authorising Alteration in, Presented *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.
Gunnery.
Amount of Practice Ammunition allowed for Heavy Guns.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 379.
"Empress of India," H.M.S.—Low Gunnery Average.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1310.
Rewards for proficiency, Alteration in Regulations since introduction of quick-firing Guns.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 840.
Ship holding the Seymour Challenge Cup, Position at parades on Shore, etc.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1321.
Target Practice—Accommodation for Officers of the Royal Garrison Artillery to witness—Number of Officers taking advantage of.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 6.
Mediterranean Squadron — Engineer Officers of the rank of Inspectors of Machinery—Relative rank of Captain, proposed.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 836; *Dec. 4*, 1318.
"Medusa," H.M.S.—Dürr Boilers, Result of Trials, Total Amount spent on the Vessel.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 15.
Officers—Income Tax, Exemption of Officers serving Abroad, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 617.
Ordnance Store Department Vacancies, Appointment of Warrant Officers—Sub-Committee Report.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 148.
Prize Money, 1856–1897—Return, Delay in circulating.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1309.
Rations—Date of introduction of New System.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 15.
Reservists in Canterbury Workhouse—Exemption from Stone-breaking, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1311.
Seamen — For collective heading, *see* Seamen.

Netherlands
Brined Vegetable Industry—Report Presented, *Nov. 25*, 373, 374.

New Member Sworn
Wason, Mr. J. C.—For County of Orkney and Zetland, *Dec. 1*, 856.

New South Wales
Women's Franchise Act—Copy Presented, *Nov. 26*, 493.

News Room of the House of Commons
Alterations in.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1304.

Newcastle, Bishop of
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1243.

Newcastle, West Union
Labourers' Scheme—Local Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 914.

Newfoundland
France and Great Britain, Agreement between, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 914.

Newton Abbott
Postmen, Scales of Pay—Placing Postmen on same scale as those at Torquay and Teignmouth, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 147.

Newtown Butler
Petty Sessions—Cases tried at Magistrate's Residence instead of in Court, Irregularity of proceeding.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 851.

Nigeria
Aro Expedition—Cost of purchase and transport of Battery of 12 pounders.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 12.
Currency of Northern and Southern Nigeria, Regulation of—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Nolan, Colonel J.P. [Galway, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 26*, 587.

Norman, Sir H.
Sugar Bounties, Abolition of—Rise in Price which must follow Abolition, Sir H. Norman's Opinion.
Os. Mr. Partington, *Nov. 24*, 325; Mr. Cust, 329.
West Indian Sugar Industry, Sir H. Norman on the inevitable Results of a Collapse in the Industry.
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 257.

North British Railway
Accidents.
Shunter at Waverley Station—Board of Trade recommendation.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 375.

North British Railway—*cont.*
Accidents—*cont.*
Tow-roping Accident at Ayton Station—Discontinuance of practice of Tow-roping, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 504.

Northampton, County of
Census—Return of Area, Houses and Population, Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Northumberland Artillery Militia
Headquarters at Berwick-on-Tweed, Retention of Camping ground for Recruits, etc.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 12.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
Army.
Civil and Veterinary Surgeons employed at home, non-participation in South African War Gratuity—Terms of Agreement, etc., *Nov. 27*, 618; *Dec. 1*, 843.
India.
Colonels of the Native Army—Promotion to Rank of General, Cases of Colonels whose promotion was stopped under the old system, *Nov. 25*, 380, 381; *Nov. 27*, 621; *Dec. 1*, 844.
Ninth Lancers, Collective Punishment by Government of India for a crime not proved against them. Effect of Punishment on Discipline, and Relations between Natives and British Troops, etc., *Nov. 21*, 185.
Sandhurst Military College—Cadets, Missing Allowances, Extra Charges, Insufficiency of food, etc., alleged, *Dec. 2*, 917.
Income Tax—Employees of Public Companies, Revenue Officers requesting information as to Salaries, *Nov. 25*, 382; *Dec. 4*, 1324, 1325.
London Water Bill, *com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1357, 1392.
Naval Cadets—Cost of Messing, Number and Character of Meals provided, *Dec. 4*, 1318.
"Parliamentary Debates," Contract for Printing, Numbers and Amounts of Tenders received, Terms of Messrs. Wyman's Contract, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1061, 1062, 1063.
South African War, Commission of Inquiry—Nature of Evidence, Terms of Reference, *Dec. 3*, 1055.

Norway
Trawlers.
Transfer of British Trawlers to Norwegian Flag, *Bona Fides* of Transfers.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 374
Trawling off the Caithness Coast—British Representations to the Government.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 23.

Nottingham
Cruelty to Animals, Case of J. Younger—Further Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov.* *25*, 375.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Irish Language, Dictionary of—Post Offices, Provision of Dictionaries of the Irish Language, proposed, *Dec.* *1*, 839.
Liverpool Post Office.
Promotions—Claims of Telegraphists to Postmasterships, etc., *Nov.* *24*, 231.
Ranelagh Place—Alleged Insanitary Condition, *Nov.* *24*, 231.
Women Assistant Supervisors—Salary Grievance, *Dec.* *1*, 839.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Central Telegraph Office.
Promotions—Conditions of entry into the Senior Class, *Nov.* *27*, 614; *Dec.* *3*, 1052.
Supervisors — Officials attached to Personal Staff of Controller promoted instead of Men in the Instrument Gallery, *Nov.* *27*, 614; *Dec.* *3*, 1052.
Civil Service Superannuation — Royal Commission of Inquiry, Date of Nomination, Terms of Reference, etc., *Dec.* *1*, 842.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, N.]
Bicycles, Riding on Footpaths—Number of Prosecutions and Convictions at Burnfoot Petty Sessions, *Nov.* *28*, 747.
Ireland.
Buncrana-Cardonagh Railway.
Arbitrators, Appointment of, prior to opening of the Line for Traffic, *Nov.* *28*, 747.
Donegal Grand Jury guarantee of Capital, Carrying out terms of, previous to Appointment of Arbitrators, *Dec.* *3*, 1051.
Civil Service — Boy Copyists Examination Centres, Inclusion of Londonderry proposed, *Dec.* *3*, 1049.
Donegal Trunk Telephone Service—Guarantees given to the Post Office, *Nov.* *28*, 745.
Lights—Changes in certain Lights, Rectification of Errors — Lieut. Webster's communication to the Commissioners, *Nov.* *28*, 747.
Tuns Bank, Lough Foyle—Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy, *Dec.* *3*, 1050.

Ogilby Estate
Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Qs. *Dec.* *4*, 1328, 1329.

O'Keeffe *v.* **Walsh**
Summing up of the Lord Chief Baron—Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Dec.* *2*, 911.

"Olenda"
Kroo Boys sjamboked overboard by British Seamen, alleged.
Q. *Nov.* *20*, 5.

Ontario
Beet Sugar, Rates of Bounty on.
Q. *Dec.* *4*, 1306.

Opium Trade, India
Correspondence between India Office and the Society for Suppression of Opium Trade—Return Ordered, *Nov.* *20*, 4; Presented, *Nov.* *27*, 609.
Revenue for last 3 years.
Q. *Nov.* *21*, 149.

Orange River Colony
Administrative Questions and Questions affecting jointly the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, *see* Transvaal.

Orangemen
Corkly Orange Lodge—Visit to Keady, Discharge of Firearms on the Public Road, Conduct of the Police, etc.
Q. *Nov.* *27*, 627.

Ordnance Store Department, Naval
Vacancies, Appointment of Warrant Officers—Sub-Committee Report.
Q. *Nov.* *21*, 148.

Orkney and Zetland
Parliamentary Bye-Election—New Member Sworn, *Dec.* *1*, 856.

Osborne Estate Bill
c. 2R. *Nov.* *21*, 198.

Osborne Estate Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *Nov.* *21*, 198.
Children of the Prince of Wales deprived of their Patrimony by the Bill, 199, 209, 214.
Committee to carry out H. M. desires in Connection with the Osborne Estate, Composition and Functions of, 210, 212, 213.
Cost to the Nation of Carrying out the Proposals of the Bill, 206, 210, 211.
Gladstone's, Mr. W. E., Reference to Case of the Osborne Estates in 1873, 206.
Information as to the Will of Her late Majesty, Withholding from the House, 200, 208.
Private Property, Laws affecting Power of the Crown to hold and dispose of, 201.
Purpose to which Osborne is devoted by the Bill, 207, 209, 211, 212, 214, 215.
Queen Victoria's Wishes as expressed in her Will, Contravention of, 199 202, 207, 209, 212.

Pacific Cable
Money issued from Consolidated Fund under Provision of Act of 1901—Account Presented, *Nov. 24*, 218, 227.
Vancouver to Fanning Island Cable—Speed Trials, Result of Tests.
Q. Dec. 1, 1305.

Parcels Post
Africa, South—Reduction in Rates, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 914.
Agricultural Products, Establishment of cheap Parcels Post for, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1326.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Militia and Yeomanry Bill—Date of Second Reading, etc., *Nov. 25*, 377; *Dec. 1*, 843.

Parliament
House of Commons.
New Members Sworn, *see* that title.
News Room, Alterations in.
Q. Dec. 4, 1304.
House of Lords.
Conservatives in Office—For all practical purposes the House of Lords disappeared.
O. Mr. Herbert Samuel, *Dec. 2*, 980.
Money Bills and the House of Lords—Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, Question of Privilege, *see* title Money Bills.
Sat first—Earl of Kimberley after the death of his Father, *Dec. 4*, 1189.
Took the Oath—Earl of Belmore, *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Parliamentary Control
Educational Finance, Haphazard way in which Parliament had discharged its prime obligation of scrutiny and control.
O. Mr. J. Lowther, *Dec. 2*, 928.

"Parliamentary Debates"
Contract for Printing.
Number and Amounts of Tenders received—Amounts of two highest and two lowest Tenders received, etc.
Qs. Dec. 3, 1061, 1062.
Wyman and Sons, Ltd., Messrs., Contract.
Copy Ordered, *Nov. 20*, 4; Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146.
Terms of, Figures quoted in first and second Tender, Fair Wage Clause, etc.
Qs. Dec. 3, 1061, 1062, 1063.

Parliamentary Elections
Education Bill, Opposition to—Decrease in Conservative Poll at By-Elections since Introduction of the Bill.
O. Mr. Herbert Samuel, *Dec. 2*, 979.

Parliamentary Elections—*cont.*
Registration Laws, Amendment of—Legislation, proposed.
Q. Nov. 20, 31.

Parliamentary Procedure
Manuscript Amendments without Notice—Limitation of practice, proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 855.
New Rules.
Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders.
Motion [Mr. A. J. Balfour], *Dec. 1*, 856.
Chaotic Condition produced by the New Rules—Rules inconsistent with each other, etc., 864, 865, 883.
Convenience and Comfort of Members preferred before the Public Service, 880.
Date of Motion—Impropriety of asking the House to deal with a Matter of such Importance at the end of a long and fatiguing Session, 857, 868, 882.
Insufficient and Unsatisfactory Experience of Working of New Rules, alleged, 857, 858, 867, 870, 875, 878, 881, 888, 889, 898, 899.
Irish Members, Absence from the House, 868, 886.
Practice of the House—Precedent of 1883, etc., 871, 882.
Referring to Select Committee, proposed, 861, 869, 873, 875, 878, 882, 885.
For particular Rules, *see* their names.
Hour of Meeting of the House, Discussion of.
Qs. Nov. 26, 514, 515.
Questions—Time occupied in the giving of Oral Answers to Questions.
Q. Dec. 1, 855.
Return to the former Rules next Session, proposed.
Qs. Nov. 25, 385, 386.

Partington, Mr. O. [Derbyshire, High Peak]
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—West Indies, Position of Price of Sugar, Loss to Working Class Consumers, etc., *Nov. 24*, 325.

Pauper Children
Longford Boarding-out Dispute—Guardians' Action against Jane Devine.
Q. Nov. 27, 626.
Training of—Utilisation of London County Council Technical Staff.
Q. Nov. 28, 743.
Village Communities—Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, etc.
Q. Nov. 20, 9.

Paupers
Workhouse Infirmaries, Inquiry into Nursing of Sick Paupers in—Report and Summary of Recommendations Presented, *Nov. 24*, 229; *Nov. 25*, 373.

Patent Law Amendment Bill
l. com., *Nov. 20*, 3.
Report*, *Nov. 24*, 226.
3R*. *Dec. 1*, 813.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 596, 597.

Peel, Mr. W. R. W. [Manchester, S.]
Penruddocke Case — Cruelty to Child, Decision of the Judge, Alteration in Law relating to Penalties to be inflicted for Cruelty to Children, proposed. *Nov. 26*, 497.

Pelham, Archdeacon
Opinions on proposed Transfer of Voluntary Schools to the Local Education Authority, and on Religious Instruction.
O. Mr. G. White, *Nov. 25*, 455; *Nov. 26*, 517.

Pendleton, Canon
Religious Instruction in Church Schools, Assertion that the Syllabus was so arranged as to give Denominational Instruction to Nonconformist Children.
O. Mr. Perks, *Dec. 2*, 1007.

Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Co.
Borneo Mails—Arrangement with the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company to call at a port in British North Borneo, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 507.

Penruddocke Case
Cruelty to Child—Decision of the Judge.
Alteration in Law relating to Penalties to be inflicted for Cruelty to Children, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 497, 506; *Nov. 27*, 612.
Penruddocke, Mr. — Removal of Name from Roll of Magistrates, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 497; *Nov. 27*, 612.

Pensions
Army, *see* that Title.

Percy, Earl—*Under-Secretary of State for India* [Kensington, S.]
Army.
Indian Army.
Colonels of Native Army, Promotions — Old and New Systems, *Nov. 25*, 380.
Lancers, 9th, Conduct at Sialkote —Publication of Report of Military Authorities, *Nov. 26*, 502.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Indian Army—*cont.*
Pay of British Soldiers, Increase in—Laying Correspondence on the Table, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 381.
Instruments for Bands and Articles of Military Dress, Exemption from Taxation proposed, *Nov. 26*, 503.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 579, 580; 3R., *Dec. 2*, 1005, 1007, 1008, 1011.

Pernau—Russia
Coal—Decrease in Imports of British Coal since imposition of the Coal Duty.
Q. Nov. 27, 611.

Persia
British Trade Interests in the Persian Gulf, Safeguarding.
Q. Dec. 1, 846.
India and Persia.
Status quo, Maintenance of, in Persia —Importance to Safety of India.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 164, 165.
Trade by Quetta-Nushki Route, etc.
Interference of Russian Medical Officers, etc.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 163.
Indo-European-Persian Telegraph Line.
Expenditure on, etc.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 164.
Spur Cable to connect Keeling Islands with Ceylon, proposed.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 165.
Karun River.
Ahwaz, Establishment of Russian Consulate at.
Q. Dec. 1, 845.
Customs Duties, Alterations in system of Collection made by the Belgian Authorities.
Q. Dec. 1, 845.
Railways and Public Works—Commission of Engineers sent from Paris to survey Southern Persia, alleged.
Q. Dec. 1, 846.

Philipps, Mr. J. W. [Pembroke]
Cardiff—Accident on Great Western Railway on 14th Nov., Inquiry, *Nov. 21*, 147.
Westbourne Park Station, Railway Accident—Result of Inquiry, *Dec. 1*, 839.

Phœnix Park, Dublin
Constabulary Depôt, Prevalence of Infectious Diseases — Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed.
Q. Nov. 25, 385.

Piers and Harbours
Ireland,
Dromod Pier, Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for construction of Pier. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 923.
Harbour Guarantees — Return of Baronies charged with, etc., Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146.
Limerick Harbour Commissioners Pilotage By-laws — Order in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.
Scotland—Grants-in-Aid, Relaxation of Regulations under which Grants-in-Aid are made, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 505.

Pierpoint, Mr. R. [Warrington]
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Postponement, proposed, etc., *Dec. 1*, 889.

Pilkington, Lieut.-Colonel R. [Lancashire, Newton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 26*, 544.

Pilotage
Limerick Harbour Commissioners By-Laws—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Platt-Higgins, Mr. F. [Salford, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 20*, 80, 81, 82, 100, 102; *con.* *Nov. 26*, 526; 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1123.
Mediterranean Squadron — Engineer Officers of rank of Inspector of Machinery, Relative rank of Captain, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 836.

Polling Districts
Southampton, County of, Alteration of certain Polling Districts — County Council Orders Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 227.

Poor Law Medical Officers, Ireland
See Medical Officers, Ireland.

Population
Census, *see* that title.

Port Sanitary Authorities
Application of Provisions of Public Health and Local Government Conferences Act to—Petition to the Local Government Board. *Q.* *Nov. 24*, 230.

Portrush Post Office
Amount of Business transacted at, Provision of new Post Office, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 29.

Portsmouth, Earl of
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R, *Dec. 4*, 1225.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Mr. A. Chamberlain.
Africa, South — Parcel Postage Rates, Reduction in, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 914.
Agricultural Products, Establishment of cheap Parcels Post for, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1326.
Employees.
Newton Abbot Postmen, Scale of Pay—Placing Postmen on same scale as those at Torquay and Teignmouth, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 21*, 147.
Stafford Postal Staff — Petition for allowance for travelling expenses. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 496.
Telegraphists' Wages, Scale of, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 8.
Hastings.
Postmen — Searching pouches after each delivery grievance. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 7.
"Special Leave"—Written application to the Postmaster Grievance. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 7.
Ireland.
Armagh Post Office Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 923.
Ballymoney Post Office—Amount of business transacted at, Reasons for abandonment of Scheme of new Post Office, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 29.
Belfast—Promotion, Claims of Senior Clerks. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 28.
Dublin, *see* that title.
Hillstreet — Sunday Delivery of Letters. proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 1*, 848.
Mail Car Contractors, Losses incurred by unpunctuality of Trains, etc. —Grievance. *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1326.
Portrush Post Office — Amount of business transacted, Provision of new Post Office, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 29.
Irish Language
Dictionary of the Irish Language, Provision of in Post Offices, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 1*, 839.
Money Order, Refusal of Postal Authorities to furnish because Names of Payee and Remitter were in Irish. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 508.
Liverpool, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Lottery and Gambling Circulars distributed by Post—making Punishable Offence, proposed.
Q. Dec. 1, 840.

Mail Service, *see* that title.

Postmen—for collective heading, *see* title Postmen.

Rural and Auxiliary Postmen—Old Age Pensions for, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1304.

Scotland—Aboyne, Compulsory retirement of Miss Moggach from Office of Postmistress, Question of Pension.
Q. Nov. 28, 745.

Telegraph Service, *see* that title.

Telephone Service, *see* that title.

Postmaster-General
Mr. A. Chamberlain.

Postmen

Hastings Post Office—Searching pouches of Postmen after each Delivery, Grievance, alleged.
Q. Nov. 20, 7.

Newton Abbot, Scale of Pay—Placing Postmen on same scale as those at at Torquay and Teignmouth, proposed.
Q. Nov. 21, 147.

Rural and Auxiliary Postmen—Old Age Pensions for, proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1304.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 50; *con. Nov. 25*, 457; *Nov. 28*, 760, 789.

Prayer Book

Alterations in Book of Common Prayer—Return Ordered, *Nov. 27*, 609.

Presbyterian Church, Ireland

Moderator of the General Assembly, Precedence of.
Q. Nov. 24, 246.

Pretoria

Field Force Canteen Contracts — Regulations.
Q. Dec. 2, 919.

Price, Mr. R. J. [Norfolk, East]

Africa, South—Trade Marks, Fees for Registration, *Dec. 4*, 1306.

Prisoners

Bail—Powers and Duties of Magistrates as regards admitting Prisoners to Bail.
Q. Nov. 26, 506.

Prison-made Goods

Foreign Prison-made Goods Act—Total value of Goods excluded from Grea Britain under.
Q. Nov. 26, 509.

Prisons, Ireland

Lynchehaun, Convict, Escape from Maryborough Gaol — Changes made in Prison Staff in consequence.
Q. Nov. 20, 28.

Warders—Transfer of R. Hennessy from Maryborough to Mountjoy Prison.
Q. Nov. 20, 28.

Private Bill Legislation

Procedure, New Rules—Converting Sessional into Standing Order without waiting for report of Committee.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Dec 1*, 861; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 872.

Private Business

Procedure, New Rules—Supply Rule and Private Business Rule mutually contradictory.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Dec. 1*, 865.

Report of Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence, Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146.

Private Members' Time

Procedure, New Rules.

Autumn Sitting, Rights of Private Members.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Dec. 1*, 872.

Curtailment of Private Members' Rights, alleged.

Observations on Motion to Convert Sessional into Standing Orders, Dec. 1, 859, 860, 861, 871, 876, 879, 885, 897, 898, 890.

Prize Money, Naval

Return for 1856-1897—Delay in Circulating.
Q. Dec. 4, 1309.

Property, Industrial

Brussels Convention, 1883 — Order in Council, Presented, *Dec.* 2, 909, 910.

Protection

Bounty System in Continental Countries, Protective Nature of the Sugar Bounties Convention, etc., *see* title Sugar Bounties—Brussels Convention.

Increase of Trade, Proportion of Increase in Free Trade and Protectionist Countries.
Os. Mr. Robson, *Nov. 24*, 314; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 346.

Public Companies

Employees' Income Tax—Revenue Officers requesting Information as to Salaries paid to Employees.
Qs. Nov. 25, 382; *Dec. 4*, 1324, 1325.

Public Health and Local Government Conferences Act

Port Sanitary Authorities, Application of Provisions of Act to—Petition to the Local Government Board.
Q. Nov. 24, 230.

Public Records
War Office—Documents of not sufficient Value to justify Preservation, Schedule Presented, *Nov. 24,* 217, 229.

Purvis, Mr. R. [Peterborough]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 27,* 643.

Queen s County
Road from Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Condition of—Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 20,* 24.

Queensland
Sugar Bounties Convention, Possibility of Repudiation by Queensland.
O. Mr. Cust, *Nov. 24,* 333.

Questions in the House
Time occupied in giving Oral Answers to Questions.
Q. *Dec. 1,* 855.

Quorum of the House
Procedure, New Rules.
Count out not to take place before 10 o'clock.
Observations on Motion to convert Sessional into Standing Orders, *Dec. 1,* 862, 873, 877, 879.
Deputy Chairman's Ruling, London Water Bill—There could be no Count out at the Evening Sitting before 10 o clock, but if a Division took place before that hour and forty Members were not present the House passed to the next Business, *Dec. 4,* 1391, 1392.
Inadequate Quorum to the Size and Dignity of the House, alleged.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Dec. 1,* 862; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 872.

Rabies
Dogs imported from Abroad, Number of Cases of Rabies among.
Qs. *Nov. 26,* 496; *Dec. 4,* 1302.

Railways
Accidents.
Cardiff—Accident on Great Western Railway on November 14, Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 21,* 147.
Shunter, Accident to, at Edinburgh, Waverley Station, Board of Trade Recommendation.
Q. *Nov. 25,* 375.
Tow-roping Accident at Ayton Station· Discontinuance of Tow-roping, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 26,* 504.
Westbourne Park, Accident at, Result of Inquiry.
Q. *Dec. 1,* 839.
Central London Railway — Vibration, Carrying out Suggestions of Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 26,* 498.

Railways—*cont.*
Communication between Passengers and Guard, Apparatus for.
Names of Companies refusing to adopt.
Q. *Dec. 4,* 1325.
Provision of Apparatus in carriages of the Great Eastern Railway Co.
Q. *Nov. 27,* 609.
Ireland.
Buncrana—Carndonagh Railway, *see* that title.
Guarantees — Return of Baronies charged with, etc., Presented, *Nov. 21,* 146.
Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway, *see* that title.
Midland Great Western Railway, Canal Traffic Tolls — Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1,* 842.
Rates between Limerick and Liverpool. — Action of the Great Southern and Western Raliway, Company.
Q. *Nov. 27,* 628.
Sligo to Bundoran, Construction of Line, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25,* 382.
State Purchase of—Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1,* 850.
Light Railway—Isle of Axholme Railway Level Crossing at Haxey, Opposition of the Parish Council, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4,* 1307.
West Highland Railway to Mallaig—Annual Report as to condition and working of.
Q. *Dec. 4,* 1326.
For particular Railways, *see* their Names.

Randles, Mr. J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Nov. 20,* 94.

Ranelagh Place, Liverpool
Post Office — Insanitary Condition of, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 20,* 231.

Rankin, Sir J. [Herefordshire, Leominster]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 28,* 783.

Rasch, Maj. F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
Army.
Lancers, 9th, Conduct of at Sialkote—Publication of Report of Military Authorities, *Nov. 26,* 502.
Officers Uniforms, Alterations in—Cost to Officers of constant alterations, *Nov. 24,* 241, 242.

[*cont.*

Rasch, Major F. C.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Tattoo and Roll Call, Abolition of—Army Order of September, *Nov. 26*, 502.
- China Operations of 1900—Issue of Clasp for Tientsin, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1314.

Rathdowney
- Road to Ballybrophy Station, Condition of—Appointment of Inspector, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 20*, 24.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
- London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1406, 1407, 1408.

Records—Public Records
- War Office—Documents of not sufficient Value to justify Preservation, Schedule Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Redmond, Mr.
- Leadership of the Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party—Resignation proposed on account of the Education Bill.
  O. Mr. E. Griffith, *Dec. 3*, 1151.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland
- Health of Children—Neglect to carry out Recommendations of Inspector, alleged.
  Q. *Nov. 26*, 510.

Registration Laws
- Amendment of—Legislation, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 20*, 31.

Reid, Mr. J. [Greenock]
- Sugar Bounties—Effect on Refining and Engineering Industries, Free Trade and the Abolition of Bounties, etc., *Nov. 24*, 315.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Sacrifice of British Financial Independence, Survival of Bounties as Surtax, Position of the West Indies, Effect on Working-class Consumers, etc., *Nov. 24*, 357.

Renshaw, Sir C. B. [Renfrew, W.]
- Commercial Education in Scotland, Encouragement of—Removal of Age restrictions on Certificates, etc., *Dec. 3*, 1064.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Parliamentary Control—Educational Finance, Haphazard way in which Parliament had discharged its prime obligation of Scrutiny and Control.
  O. Mr. J. Lowther, *Dec. 2*, 928.
- Report from Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1333.

Ribblesdale, Lord
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1278, 1286, 1287, 1288.

Rickett, Mr. J. Compton [Scarborough]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 563.

Ridley, Mr. W. [Stalybridge]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25*, 392.

Rigg, Mr. R. [Westmorland, Appleby]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 28*, 749.

Riley, Mr. Athelstan
- Religious Instruction, Mr. Riley's attempted modification of the London School Board Syllabus.
  - *References to, in Debate on the Education Bill, Nov. 25*, 422, 515, 522.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Croydon]
- Income Tax—Employees of Public Companies, Revenue Officers requesting information as to Salaries, *Nov. 25*, 382; *Dec. 4*, 1325.
- Osborne Estate Bill, 2R, *Nov. 21*, 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214.

Roads
- Ireland.
  - Meath, County of—Condition of Road from Hill of Down to Ballivor.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 26.
  - Queen's County—Condition of Road from Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 24.
- Ross-shire, Western District—Construction of Roads, Application for Grant-in-Aid.
  Q. *Dec. 4*, 1303.

Roberts, Mr. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 25*, 460.

Roberts, Mr. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 559.
- Llangollen National Schools — Children interrogated as to Religious Belief of Parents, Treatment of Children of Nonconformists, *Nov. 25*, 383.
- Sunday Closing, Wales—Translation o Licensing Act of 1902 into Welsh, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1324.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 28*, 751.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
Africa, South—British Troops in, Number of, *Dec. 1*, 843.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 36, 55, 56, 57, 61, 65, 67.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1334.
Osborne Estate Bill, 2R, *Nov. 21*, 208, 211.
Sugar Duties, Brussels Convention—Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Russia in 1859, Effect on the Brussels Sugar Convention, *Dec. 3*, 1059.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Tory Party and Free Trade, British Consumer penalised to save Continental Exchequers, Protective Character of Convention, etc., *Nov. 24*, 308, 346.

Rock Angus
Lighting of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1331

Rogers, District Inspector
Military Barracks at Trim, Occupancy of—Yearly lodging allowance made to Inspector Rogers, etc.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Rolleston, Sir. J F. L. [Leicester]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R., *Dec. 2*, 1017.

Roscommon
Hillstreet Postal Service—Sunday Delivery of letters, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.
Union Hospital, Management of—Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 853.

Ross-shire
Road Construction in the Western Districts—Application for Grant-in-Aid.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1303.

Royal Irish Constabulary
see Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 92 ; *con. Nov. 26*, 529, 534.

Russell, Lord John
Money Bills and Money Clauses in Bills, Powers of the House of Lords—Unwisdom of insistence on House of Commons Privilege where the Lords' Amendments were obviously intended to improve the measure in question.
O. Earl of Halsbury, *Dec. 1*, 829.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
Ireland.
Boycotting—Number of Families and Persons boycotted throughout Ireland, *Dec. 4*, 1327.

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Ogilby Estate — Delay in sale to Tenants, *Dec. 4*, 1328, 1329.
Second term Rents, Number fixed, Average reductions, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1327.
Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—Date of Taking, *Dec. 4*, 1333.

Russia
Afghanistan and Russia.
Commercial Relations between—Direct Communication between Russian Government and the Amir alleged.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 845.
Russian Commercial Representative at the Court of the Amir, Rumours as to.
O. Mr. J. Walton, *Nov. 21*, 163.
Ahwaz, Persia—Establishment of Russian Consulate.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 845.
Brussels Sugar Convention—Non-inclusion of Russia.
Commercial Treaty, British Government prepared to denounce in the event of Difficulties arising in connection with Most - Favoured-Nation Clause.
Observations in Debate on Sugar Convention, Nov. 24, 269, 285, 286
Insignificance of Russian Export to this country.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 24*, 340.
Swiss Sugar Manufacturers, Rivalry of British Industry, Possible stimulation by cheap Russian Sugar,
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 264.
China, Railways in — Construction of Branch Line from Siberian Railway to Pekin, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 837.
Great Britain and Russia—Treaties.
Commerce and Navigation, Treaty of 1859—Steps taken by the British Government to denounce, Effect on the Brussels Sugar Convention, etc.
Qs. *Dec. 3*, 1057, 1058, 1059; *Dec. 4*, 1323.
Treaty alleged to have been signed in 1844.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 503.
Pernau—Decrease in Imports of British Coal since imposition of the Coal Duty.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 611.
Zafarini Islands off the Coast of Morocco—Acquisition of as Coaling Station, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1322.

St. Patrick's Schools, Bradford
Control of, if the Education Bill became Law—Father Gosse's Invitation to the City Council to assist in Control of the Schools.
O. Mr. Wanklyn, *Nov. 27*, 697.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Money Bills and Money Clauses in Bills, Powers of the House of Lords—Altering a Financial Bill in Committee a "Grave departure from ancient Practice," etc.—Marquess of Salisbury's Dictum.
O. Earl Spencer, *Dec. 1*, 824, 825.

Salisbury School, Blackburn
Religious Instruction, Operation of Voluntary Arrangements.
O. Mr. Toulmin, *Nov. 26*, 556.

Salmon Fisheries
Report of Commission—Introduction of Bill to carry out Recommendations, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1307.

Samuel, Mr. H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
London Water Bill, *com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1412.

Samuel, Mr. Herbert [Yorkshire, W.R. Cleveland]
British East Africa and Uganda—Issue of Government Paper Currency, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 16, 17; *Nov. 24*, 243.
Cleveland Parliamentary Election — Alleged Leaflet stating that School Fees would be universally enforced if the Education Bill became law.
Os. Mr. Talbot, *Dec. 3*, 1134, 1138; Mr. Herbert Samuel, 1138.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R., *Dec. 2*, 973; *Dec. 5*, 1138.
Registration Laws, Amendment of—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 20*, 31.
Somaliland Operations—Names of Battalions of King's African Rifles ordered for Service, *Nov. 24*, 244.
Unemployed—Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 623.

Samuel, Mr. S. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Argentine Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for Slaughter — Progress of Negotiations with the Argentine Government, *Nov. 20*, 11.

Sandford Estate, Castlerea
Purchase of, by the Congested Districts Board, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 385.

Sandhurst Military College
Cadets — Messing Allowances, Extra Charges, Insufficiency of Food, etc., alleged.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 917.

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Education (England and Wales) Bill — Roman Catholic Schools, Amount of Grant, *Nov. 20*, 30.
Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules — Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Objections to Supply Rule, etc., *Dec. 1*, 887.

Sassoon, Sir E. [Hythe]
Cable Communication.
India, Communication with—Connection of Keeling Islands by Spur Cable with Ceylon, etc., *Nov. 21*, 165, 166.
Vancouver to Fanning Island Cable—Speed Trials, Results of Tests, *Dec. 4*, 1305.
India, Financial and Economic Position of—Effect of Currency Changes, Reduction in Value of the People's Savings, etc.—Commission of Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 21*, 165.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hn. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 27*, 694.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Argentine Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for Slaughter — Progress of Negotiations with the Argentine Government, *Nov. 20*, 19; *Nov. 27*, 623.
Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy — Government Agreement, Date of Submitting to the House, *Nov. 26*, 513.

Scotland
Secretary—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Under-Secretary—Sir C. Scott-Moncrieff.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.
Solicitor-General — Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.
Aboyne Post Office—Compulsory Retirement of Miss Moggach from Office of Postmistress, Question of Pension.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 745.
Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers—Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 619.
Bars, Number of Women employed—Date of Issue of Return.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 748.
Broad Bay, Trawling in, *see* title Trawling.
Commercial Education, Encouragement of—Removal of Age restrictions on Certificates, etc.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1064.
Congested Districts Board, *see* that title.
Edinburgh, Waverley Station, Accident to Shunter—Board of Trade Recommendation.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 375.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
  Glasgow—Lawyer witholding damages awarded to his Client—Interlocutor issued by the Sheriff of Glasgow. *Q.* *Nov. 27*, 613.
  Glasgow University—Degrees of Science in Public Health, Regulations for, University Court Ordinance Presented, *Nov. 20*, 2; *Nov. 21*, 145.
  Harbours—Grants-in-Aid, Relaxation of Regulations under which Grants-in-Aid are made, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 505.
  Lewis, Island of, *see* that title.
  Lunatics—Rules for Reception of Pauper Lunatics in Poorhouses, Presented, *Dec. 2*, 910; *Dec. 4*, 1189.
  Mail Service, *see* that title.
  Moray Firth, Trawling in—British-owned Trawlers under Foreign Flags, Legislation, proposed. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 912.
  Mallaig, West Highland Railway to, Condition and Working of—Date of Issue of Annual Report. *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1326.
  North British Railway — Tow Roping Accident at Ayton Station, Discontinuance of practice of Tow-Roping, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 504.
  Road Construction in Western Ross-shire —Application for Grant-in-Aid. *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1303.
  Spirits, Stock in Bond on March 31, 1901, Total Spirits Bonded and cleared from Bond from March, 1901, to March, 1902—Return Ordered, *Dec. 4*, 1302.
  Stornoway, *see* that title.
  Trawling, for collective heading, *see* title Trawling.
  Western Hebrides, Mail Service—Class of Boat employed, Time occupied in Transit, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 24*, 245.

Seamen, Naval
  Annual Leave and Free Passes Home for Men on Active Service, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 498.
  Cost per head of trained Seamen. *Q.* *Nov. 27*, 613.
  Statistics of efficient Seamen in the Channel Fleet. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 5.

Secondary and Technical Instruction
  Ireland—Equivalent Grant. *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1313.
  Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of Act of 1889, Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
  Wireless Telegraphy, Adopting as a means of Communication between Lighthouses and the Shore, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 912.

Session of 1902
  Date of Termination. *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 386.

Session of 1903
  Date of calling Parliament together. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 514.

Shackleton, Mr. W. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe.]
  Evening Continuation Schools—Grants payable under Section XX. of the Regulations, *Nov. 24*, 234.

Shader
  Landing place—Delay in Construction of. *Q.* *Nov. 27*, 625.

Shanghai
  Evacuation by the European Troops.
    Correspondence respecting Presented, *Dec. 2*, 909, 910.
    International Troops, Date of Withdrawal. *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 381.

Shannon Development Company
  Amount of Subsidy paid to, Discontinuance of, proposed. *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 385.
  Dromod Pier, Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for construction of Pier. *Q.* *Dec. 2*, 923.

Shaw, Mr. C. [Stafford]
  Stafford Post Office Employees—Petition for Allowance for Travelling Expenses, *Nov. 26*, 496.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
  Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Position of the West Indies, Bounties surviving as Surtax, Tax on Consumers, Danger of Tariff Wars, etc., *Nov. 24*, 334.

Shipping
  see Mercantile Marine.

Sialkote
  Lancers, 9th, Conduct of, *see* India—Army.

Sinclair, Capt. J. [Forfar]
  Artillery, Royal—Status of Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels. *Nov. 24*, 237.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
  London-Irish Rifle Volunteers—Appointment of Service Officer to the Command, proposed, *Dec. 3*, 1054.
  London Water Bill, *com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1415.

Sittings of the House
  Procedure, New Rules — Suspension of Sitting in Case of Disorder in the House, Empowering Speaker to Suspend Sitting.
    Observations in Debate on Motion to Convert Sessional into Standing Orders, *Dec. 1*, 858, 883, 891, 894, 896.

Sligo
Lunatic Asylum, Overcrowding in, alleged. *Q. Nov. 25*, 384.
Railway Line to Bundoran, Construction of, proposed. *Q. Nov. 25*, 382.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Ireland.
Belfast.
National School Teachers—Payments of balance of Grade Salary, *Nov. 26*, 509.
Post Office — Promotion, Claims of Senior Clerks, *Nov. 20*, 28.
Superintending Engineer's Office —Assistants appointed Ballina and Mullingar, Claims of Belfast Telegraphists, *Nov. 27*, 628.
Telegraph Service, Office in Donegal Street, Establishment of, proposed, *Nov 26*, 508.
Downpatrick — Sunday Demonstrations during Church hours, Prohibition of, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 850, 851.
Longford Boarding - out Dispute—Guardians' Action against Jane Devine, *Nov. 27*, 626, 627.
Mohill Workhouse Entertainment —Local Government Board Sanction of Licence for Sale of Liquors, etc., *Nov. 20*, 25, 26.
National School Teachers—Teachers of Needlework required to qualify in Physical Science and Manual Instruction, alleged, *Dec. 1*, 851.
Newtownbutler Petty Sessions — Cases Tried at Magistrates' Residence instead of in Court, Irregularity of Proceeding, *Dec. 1*, 851.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Condition of Health of Children—Neglect to Carry out Recommendations of Inspector, alleged, *Nov. 26*, 510.
Kensit, Mr. J. A. Imprisonment of—Reduction of Sentence—Special Circumstances of Case, *Nov. 27*, 623.
Soldiers and Sailors—Annual Leave and Free Passes Home for Men on Active Service, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 498.

Small Holdings
Number of Owners, and Acreage acquired under provisions of Act of 1892. *Q. Nov. 26*, 505.

Smith, Mr. A. H. [Herts, Hertford]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R., *Dec. 2*, 1001, 1003.

Smith, Mr. Parker [Lanark, Partick]
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention, Price of Sugar, Position of the West Indies, Cost of Sugar Production, Trades affected by Bounties, etc., *Nov. 24*, 288, 289.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster
London Water Bill, *com.*, *Dec. 4*, 1402.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
Coastguards at Ilfracombe — Failure to keep proper Look-out, alleged, *Nov. 27*, 610,

Soldier Settlers
Soldiers discharged in South Africa, Number of,—Inducements to settle in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. *Q. Nov. 26*, 500.

Solicitor-General
Sir E. Carson.

Solictor-General for Scotland
Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.

Solicitors
Glasgow Solicitor withholding damages awarded to Client—Interlocutor issued by the Sheriff of Glasgow. *Q. Nov. 27*, 613.
Ireland—Union Solicitors, Eligibility for Membership of County Councils. *Q. Nov. 20*, 27.
Irish Language—Refusal of Incorporated Law Society to make Irish an optional Subject in Examinations. *Q. Nov. 26* 509.

Solomon Islands, British
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741, 742.

Solway
Fishery Regulations—Assimilation of Byelaws on both sides of the Solway, proposed. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1315.

Somaliland
Operations against the Mad Mullah—Names of Battalions of King's African Rifles ordered for Service. *Q. Nov. 24*, 244.

South African War
Blockhouses, Cost of, Disposal by Sale, etc. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1317.
Commission of Inquiry—Nature of Evidence, Terms of Reference. *Q. Dec. 3*, 1055.
Concentration Camps — Expenditure of Foreign Contributions. *Q. Nov. 21*, 149.
Electrical Engineers, Recognition of Services. *Q. Nov. 25*, 377.

[cont.

South African War—*cont.*

Gratuity granted to Warrant Officers, Non-commissioned Officers and Men.

Civil and Veterinary Surgeons serving at home, Non-participation in, Terms of Agreement, etc.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 618 ; *Dec. 1*, 843.

Exclusion of Officers from Participation.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 617.

Inniskilling Fusiliers, First Battalion—Date of return from South Africa.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 616.

Martial Law.

Commission of Inquiry—Date of presenting Report to the House.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 12.

Notices advertised in *Het Oosten*, Delay in payment of Account.
Q. *Nov. 21*, 149.

Medals, *see* that title.

Officers — Number mentioned in Despatches, serving with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 617.

Peace Terms—Protest of Boer Generals to Lord Kitchener — Publication of, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1055.

Transport Service—Names, Tonnage, etc. of Vessels employed, Date of Issue of Return.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 619.

Veterinary Surgeons — Employment of Surgeons not Members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 11.

Southampton, County of

Polling Districts, Alteration of—County Council Orders Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 227.

Spain

Bilbao Harbour Lights—Defective System of Lighting, Representations to the Spanish Government.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 615.

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully [Carlisle].

Adjournment of the House—Government Business set down for the Morning Sitting had been disposed of—There was no effective Business set down for the Evening Sitting and none could be, as there was no Business left over from the Morning Sitting—It was therefore the Speaker's Duty to adjourn the House, *Dec. 1*, 908.

Amendments—Education Bill.

Raising Money—The Amendment appeared to be in order ,as it only affected the Method of Raising Money, *Nov. 28*, 810.

Speaker—*cont.*

Amendments—*cont.*

Religious Instruction—Details as to the Mode in which Religious Instruction should be carried on did not arise on the Amendment—To some extent they were involved in the question of whether the Foundation Managers were to have a Majority, and hon. Members might state their views as to what the result might be, but this detailed discussion was out of order, *Nov. 26*, 582.

Attack on a Bill—It was not in order on every Amendment to make a general Attack on a Bill, *Nov. 26*, 572

Bill which had been withdrawn—The Member must not argue on a Bill which was not before the House, *Nov. 24*, 321.

Chair, Disrespect to—It was hardly a respectful way of treating the Chair for the Member to remark that he had now said all he wanted to say, *Nov. 26*, 525.

Clauses of the Education Bill which should have been moved in Committee and not on Report Stage, and Clauses which should have been moved as Amendments, *Nov. 25*, 387, 388.

Irrelevant Observations.

Education (England and Wales) Bill *Nov. 25*, 396, 398, 437.

Discussing a speech made upon another Amendment the day before, which had no particular bearing upon the question before the House, *Nov. 26*, 524, 525.

Discussing total Expenditure under the Bill on a motion which restricted the Debate to questions of Apportionment of Expenditure and Methods of raising Funds by Loan or otherwise, *Dec. 2*, 932.

Persia, Disturbance of the *Status quo*—Discussing in Debate on Indian Financial Statement, *Nov. 21*, 164, 165.

Procedure, New Rules—Motion to Convert Sessional into Standing Orders—Irrelevant Discussion.

Consolidation Bills, Machinery proposed for, *Dec. 1*, 874.

Dinner Hour Interval, *Dec. 1*, 876.

Questions.

Arguing on the re-drafted Clause of a Bill, *Nov. 27*, 633.

Arguing the Question, *Dec. 2*, 921.

Making a Speech on Putting a Question, *Nov. 24*, 239.

Speaking Twice on the Question before the House, *Nov. 26*, 606.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 26*, 587.

Spencer, Earl
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 4*, 1208, 1209, 1211.
- Money Bills and the House of Lords—Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, Question of Privilege, *Dec. 1*, 823, 826, 827.
- Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for discussion by the House of Lords before Ratification, *Nov. 24*, 218.

Spirits
- Scotland—Stock of Spirits in Bond on March 31, 1901, Total Spirits Bonded and cleared from Bond from March, 1901, to March, 1902—Return Ordered, *Dec. 4*, 1302.

Stafford
- Post Office Employees—Petition for allowance for travelling expenses. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 496.

Stamp Duties
- British Insurance Policies in Sweden. Stamp Duties charged on, Violation of the Treaty of Upsala of 1654, alleged. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 495.

Stanley, Lord—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Lancashire, West Houghton]
- Africa, South, British Troops in.
  - Families of Soldiers detained in South Africa—Sending Families to South Africa, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 379.
  - Natal — Permanent Military Headquarters, *Dec. 1*, 843.
  - Number of, *Dec. 1*, 843.
- Army Corps—Effective Strength of First, Second, and Third Army Corps, *Nov. 25*, 379.
- Contracts—Belfast Barracks Bread Contract given to firm of Druggists and Chemists, *Nov. 27*, 629.
- Officers—Allowances to Officers serving in South Africa, Increase in, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 619.
- South African War.
  - Civil and Veterinary Surgeons employed at home, Non-participation in South African War Gratuity — Terms of Agreement, etc., *Nov. 27*, 618 ; *Dec. 1*, 843.
  - Commission of Inquiry—Nature of Evidence, Terms of Reference, *Dec. 3*, 1055.
  - Medals — Volunteer and Colonial Officers, Number of Medals awarded, *Dec. 3*, 1056.
  - Number of Officers mentioned in Despatches serving with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments, *Nov. 27*, 618.

Stanley, Lord—*cont.*
- Strength of the Regular Army at Home, *Dec. 3*, 1056.
- Volunteers—Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers—Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy, *Nov. 27*, 619.

Stanley, Mr. A. [Lancashire, Ormskirk]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Provision of School Buildings free of charge, Managers' Liability for Rates and Taxes, *Nov. 24*, 234.

Steamship Subsidies
- Report of Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix Presented, *Dec. 3*, 1067.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye]
- Grove Park Workhouse—Local Government Board Loan, Extension of Period of Repayment—Proposed Deputation to Mr. Long, *Nov. 20*, 10.

Stewart, Sir M. [Kirkcudbright]
- Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers—Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy, *Nov. 27*, 619.

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. [Glasgow, College]
- Meteorological Grant—Progress in Selection of Committee, *Nov. 21*, 146.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, E.]
- Agricultural Products, Colonial Bounties on, Amounts of, etc.—Return proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1307.

Stornoway
- Burying Grounds, Provision of. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 21.
- Fishermen's Dwellings, Allocation of Sites. *Q.* *Nov. 20*, 21.
- Holm, Loch, Construction of Dry Dock—Petition for Grant from the Congested Districts Board. *Q.* *Dec. 1*, 838.
- Mail Service—Refusal of Messrs MacBrayne to convey goods from Stornoway to Kyle, alleged. *Q.* *Dec. 3*, 1066.

Subsidies on Shipping
- Cunard Steamship Company Subsidy, Government Agreement, Date of submitting to the House. *Q.* *Nov. 26*, 513.
- Report of Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix Presented, *Dec. 3*, 1067.

Sugar
- Beet Sugar Cultivation in England, Possibility and Prospects of. *O.* Mr. W. F. Lawrence, *Nov. 24*, 323.
- Bounties—Brussels Convention.
  - Bill, Date of Introduction, Adequate Opportunity for discussion, etc. *Q.* *Nov. 27*, 630.

[*cont.*

Sugar—*cont.*
- Bounties, etc.—*cont.*
  - British Exporters of Confectionery, Benefits derived from Article III.
    - *Q. Dec. 2*, 919.
  - Cartels with Surtax, Steps taken to abolish.
    - *Q. Dec. 4*, 1308.
  - Clauses, Doubts as to Interpretation of, Reference to be made to *procès verbal.*
    - *Q. Dec. 4*, 1308.
  - Colonies.
    - Canadian Bounty on Beet Sugar, Rate of.
      - *Q. Dec. 4*, 1306.
    - Sugar from British Self-governing Colonies, Imposition of Countervailing Duties—Interpretation of Article IV.
      - *Q. Dec. 2*, 920, 921 ; *Dec. 4*, 1308, 1312.
  - *Debate* [*Commons*] *Nov. 24*, 251, 320.
    - Bounties to Sugar-growing Colonies—Alternative Policy, proposed, 321.
    - Bounty System in Continental Countries.
      - Growth of, 254, 350.
      - Objects of, etc., 296, 301, 303, 327, 345, 346, 347.
      - Persistence of Bounties as Surtax, 336, 338, 360.
    - Cartel System—New form of Indirect Bounty in Austria and Germany, 258, 290, 311.
      - Persistence of, under the Convention, 284, 311.
    - Cobden Treaty Precedent, 324.
    - Colonies, Position of under the Convention—Preferential Treatment forbidden, etc., 269, 284, 290, 301, 302, 333.
    - Commercial Treaties—Difficulties in connection with most-favoured-nation Clause, 253, 267, 269.
    - Commission of Inquiry, proposed, 321.
    - Consensus of Opinion as to Advantages of Abolition, 351.
    - Consumers, Effect of Abolition on Interests of, 261, 264, 279, 301, 312, 319, 321, 326, 329, 337, 354, 355, 362.
    - Continental Countries, Objects in promoting Convention
      - Protection, Drawing England towards, 312.
      - Relieving their Exchequers at the Expense of British Consumers, etc., 297, 298 309, 312.
    - Cost of Production of Sugar, Probable future Cost, etc., 262, 263, 291.

Sugar—*cont.*
- Bounties—*cont.*
  - *Debate* [*Commons*]—*cont.*
    - Countervailing Duties.
      - Adoption of Principle by United States and India, 254.
      - Free Trade Policy, Instrument of, 266.
      - Royal Commission Objections to, 268, 287, 299, 381.
    - Countries remaining outside the Convention, 332.
    - Engineering Industry, Effect of Convention on, 295.
    - Equality of opportunity for British Subjects engaged in Sugar Industry, Failure to secure, 299, 326.
    - Financial Independence of Great Britain destroyed by the Convention, alleged, 275, 284, 290 297, 301, 310, 358.
    - Folly of System, Continental Countries beginning to recognise, 279, 297, 313, 314.
    - Government making the measure a question of confidence, 319, 334, 338.
    - Indian Countervailing Duties, Results of, 289, 310.
    - Liberal Party Attitude—Previous Conferences and Conventions, etc., 252, 260, 271.
    - Maximum Bounty, Amount of—Mr. J. Chamberlain's Remark, 279, 288.
    - "Open Door," Key handed over to a European Syndicate, alleged, 275, 284, 290, 358.
    - Penal Clause — Alternative of prohibiting entry of bounty-fed Sugar, or imposing Countervailing Duties on it, 266, 276.
      - Colonies, exception from operation of the Clause, 290.
      - Complicated Provisions of, 285.
      - Contravention of fundamental Principle of British Customs Duties, 274.
    - Price of Sugar.
      - Cost of Production compared with Price, 258, 260.
      - Fall in Price—Causes of, 282, 292.
      - Fluctuations caused by Bounty System, 262, 291.
      - Importance of Cheap Sugar to Great Britain—Advantages of present System, etc., 328.

[*cont.*

Sugar—*cont.*
  Bounties, etc.—*cont.*
    Debate [*Commons*]—*cont.*
      Price of Sugar—*cont.*
        Indian Countervailing Duties, Effect of, 289.
        Regularity in Price which would follow Abolition, Importance to Trade, etc., 356.
        Rise which would follow Abolition of Bounties, Extent of, etc., 260, 278, 288, 291, 293, 299, 305, 319, 323, 325, 329, 361.
      Protective Nature of the Convention, 311, 342.
      Russia, Possibilities of Tariff War with under the Convention, etc., 269, 285, 340.
      Scope of the Convention, 271.
      Sources whence British Market is supplied, 264, 328.
      Subsidiary Trades, Jam making, Confectionery, etc., Effect on, 280, 293, 294, 301, 306, 307, 315, 316, 317, 326, 337, 350, 362.
      Sugar Refiners, Sufferings from unfair Competition, etc., 256, 280, 311, 315, 317, 319, 330, 337, 350, 362.
        Sugar Tax, Beneficial Effects of, alleged, 300, 324.
      Tariff Wars, Dangers of, under the Convention, 270, 302, 314, 337.
      United States and Cuba, Future Production of, likely to nullify Convention, 283, 353, 336.
      West Indies, Effect of Convention on, *see* West Indies—Sugar Industry.
    House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion of Convention prior to Ratification.
      Debate (Lords), *Nov. 24*, 218.
    Russia, Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with (1859)—Steps taken by the Government to denounce, Effect on the Brussels Convention, etc.
      Qs. Dec. 3, 1057, 1058, 1059; *Dec. 4*, 1323.
    Shipping Trade—Effect of Ratification of Convention on.
      Q. Dec 3, 1059.
    Surtax on Imports, Amount of—Equality of Import Duty on Goods throughout the Contracting Countries, proposed.
      Qs. Dec. 2, 919, 920.

Sugar—*cont.*
  Bounties—*cont.*
    Translation from French to English, Inconsistencies in English Version Preparation of Correct Translation, etc.
      Qs. Nov. 28, 742; *Dec. 4*, 1322, 1323.
  Consumption per head in the United Kingdom.
    Os. Sir W. Harcourt, *Nov. 24*, 280; Mr. Cust, 329.
  Refineries.
    Number working in Great Britain, Number of Tons of Sugar refined in 1902, 1901, 1891, 1881, and 1871.
      Q. Nov. 20, 17.
    Sugar Bounties, Unfair Competition produced by, Condition of Industry, etc.
      Observations in Debate on Brussels Sugar Convention, Nov. 24, 256.

Sunday Closing, Wales
  Effect of Licensing Act of 1902—Issue of Explanatory Notice in Welsh, proposed.
    Qs. Nov. 20, 18; *Dec. 4*, 1324.

Superannuation
  Civil Service, *see* that title.
  Jersey Elementary School Teachers—Rules Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1302.

Supply
  Procedure, New Rule—Closure of Votes in Classes, etc.
    Observations on Motion to Convert Sessional into Standing Orders, 1 Dec., 866, 869, 877, 880, 884, 887, 888.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill
  l. Commons Amendts. *con.*, *Nov. 20*, 3.
    Royal Assent, *Nov. 25*, 373,

Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland
  Rules of Court—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 20*, 4; *Nov. 21*, 145.

Sweden
  Stamp Duties on British Insurance Policies—Violation of the Treaty of Upsala, alleged.
    Q. Nov. 26, 495

Switzerland
  Education, Expenditure on, compared with the Expenditure by Great Britain.
    O. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Dec. 3*, 1115.
  Sugar-using Industries, Rivalry with British Industries—Possible effect of Brussels Convention in flooding Switzerland with cheap Russian Sugar.
    O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 264.
  Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 28*, 741.

Swords Borough School
Keegan, M., Successful Competitor for Scholarship disqualified by Examiners—Enforcing decision of Education Commissioners.
Q. *3 Dec.* 1066.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 109; *con. Nov. 25*, 442; *Nov. 26*, 536, 552, 579, 3R; *Dec. 2*, 959; *Dec. 3*, 1076, 1077, 1132, 1135, 1138.
Voluntary Schools, Jobbery in distribution of Special Aid Grant—Charge against Diocesan Boards, *Dec. 2*, 959.

Tallow
Police Force—Cost of extra Police, Area of Charge, etc.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Tata, Mr.
Cotton Industry in India, Decline in Market Values, etc.—Mr. Tata's Evidence.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *Nov. 21*, 168.

Taylor, Mr. Austin [Liverpool, East Toxteth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 553.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 572, 573.
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1378

Teachers
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.
Jersey—Superannuation Rules for Elementary School Teachers, Presented, *Dec. 4*, 1189, 1302.
School Teachers' Houses, Grants for 1843–1881, Return Presented, *Nov 20*, 1.

Technical Education
see Secondary and Technical Education.

Telegraph Service
Central Telegraph Office Staff.
Pay Grievance.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 495.
Promotions—Conditions of entry into the Senior Class.
Qs. *Nov. 27*, 614; *Dec. 3*, 1052
Supervisors — Officials attached to Personal Staff of Controller promoted instead of Men in the Instrument Gallery.
Qs. *Nov. 27*, 614; *Dec. 3*, 1052.
Employees' Wages, Scale of
Q. *Nov. 20*, 8.
Ireland
Armagh Telegraph Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged
Q. *Dec. 2*, 923.
Belfast, *see* that title.
Liverpool Telegraphists — Promotion, Claims to Post-mastership, etc.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 231.

Telegraph Service—*cont.*
Revenue and Expenditure—Account for year ended March 31, 1902, Presented, *Nov. 24*, 218, 228.
Wireless Telegraphy, Adopting as a means of communication between Lighthouses and the Shore, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 2*, 912.

Telephone Service
Ireland.
Donegal Trunk Service—Guarantees given to the Post Office.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 745.
Rural Districts, Telephonic Communication between, proposed.
Q. *Dec. 1*, 848.
Post Office and National Telephone Company's Charges, Discrepancies between—Statement of Chairman of Establishments Committee of the London County Council.
Q. *Nov. 28*, 746.
Tunbridge Wells Municipal System, Purchase by the National Telephone Company—Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk — Local Inquiry, proposed.
Qs. *Dec. 1*, 841, 846.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 20*, 120.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Coal Duty.
Russia, Pernau—Decrease in Imports of British Coal since imposition of the Coal Duty, *Nov. 27*, 611.
Shipments to Holland, Belgium and the Baltic Ports, Decrease in, since imposition of Coal Duty. *Nov. 24*, 235.
Local Government Board and Board of Trade—Salaries of Officials placed on inferior Scale to those in Departments presided over by Secretaries of State, *Nov. 25*, 378.
Trade, Board of—Changes in Composition of, Increasing Status and dignity of the Board, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 493.

Thomas, Mr. F. Freeman [Hastings]
Hastings Post Office.
Postmen — Searching Pouches after each delivery Grievance, *Nov. 20*, 7.
"Special Leave"—Written application to the Postmaster, Grievance, *Nov. 20*, 7.
Volunteer Capitation Grants and Camp Leave—Regulations of April 22, 1902, *Nov. 20*, 14.

Thomson, S.
Accident at Waverley Station—Board of Trade Recommendation.
Q. *Nov. 25*, 375.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, N.]
- Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway.
  - Goods Wagons attached to Passenger Trains—Non-compliance of Regulations as to Automatic Brakes, *Dec. 2*, 913.
  - Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway Station at Londonderry, Condition of—Building New Station Proposed, *Dec. 2*, 913.

Tientsin
- Military Operations of 1900—Issue of Clasp, proposed. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1314.

Tipperary
- County Infirmary Committee—Refusal to Carry out suggestions of Local Government Board Auditor. *Q. Nov. 24*, 248.

Tiumpan Head Lighthouse
- Trawlers in Broad Bay, Detection of Illegal Trawling — Extension of System to other Lighthouses on the Scottish Coast, proposed. *Q. Nov. 27*, 624.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 585.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Bury]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 556.

Tow-Roping
- North British Railway—Accident to Guard at Ayton Station, Discontinuance of Tow-roping, proposed. *Q. Nov. 26*, 504.

Trade, Board of
- *President*—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
- Composition of, Changes in, Increasing Status and dignity of the Board, proposed. *Q. Nov. 26*, 494.
- Salaries of Upper Division Officials placed on Inferior Scale to those in Departments presided over by Secretaries of State. *Q. Nov. 25*, 378.

Trade Marks
- Africa, South—Fees for Registration of Trade Marks. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1306.

Trade Reports
- Annual Series Presented, *Nov. 26*, 494; *Nov. 27*, 609; *Nov. 28*, 741.
- Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Nov. 26*, 494.

Trade and Commerce
- Colonial Trading Companies, Parliamentary and Municipal Representation—Circular Despatch Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146; *Nov. 24*, 217.
- Depression in, *see* title Unemployed.
- Russian Treaty of 1859—Steps taken by the British Government to denounce, Effect on the Brussels Sugar Convention, etc. *Qs. Dec. 3*, 1057, 1058, 1059; *Dec. 4*, 1323.

Trains
- Communication between Passengers and Guard
  - Names of Companies refusing to adopt. *Q. Dec. 4*, 1325.
  - Provision of Apparatus in Carriages on the Great Eastern Railway Co. *Q. Nov. 27*, 609.

Transport Service
- South African War—Names, Tonnage, etc., of Vessels employed—Date of Issue of Return. *Q. Nov. 27*, 619.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony
- Boers, Grant to
  - Administration of, Local Authorities entrusted with. *Qs. Dec. 2*, 915, 916.
  - Amount expended, Purchase of Diseased Animals, alleged — Agricultural Machinery, provision of, proposed. *Q. Nov. 20*, 13.
- Liquor Ordinance—Date of publication of Text. *Q. Nov. 28*, 746.
- Mortgaged Lands—Ordinance suspending right of Sale or foreclosure, Extension of, proposed. *Q. Nov. 24*, 238, 239.
- Permit Regulations, Oaths of Allegiance, etc.—Case of M. du Toit. *Q. Nov. 24*, 233.
- Railways, Extension of. *Q. Nov. 26*, 496.
- Repatriation Commissions, Number appointed, Constitution of, etc. *Qs. Dec. 2*, 915, 916.

Trawling.
- Scotland.
  - British-owned Trawlers under Foreign flags fishing in Moray Firth—Legislation, proposed. *Q. Dec 2*, 212.
  - Broad Bay, Illegal Trawling in.
    - Cruiser for protection of Interests of Line Fishermen, Application for Treasury Grant. *Q. Dec. 2*, 922.
    - Frequent occurrence of Cases—Legislation proposed. *Q. Nov. 26*, 507.

[*cont.*

Trawling—*cont.*
  Scotland—*cont.*
    Caithness Coast—Illegal Trawling by Norwegian Trawlers — Representations to the Norwegian Government.
      Q. *Nov. 20*, 23.
    Penalties for Illegal Trawling—Increasing maximum penalty, proposed.
      Q. *Dec. 4*, 1327.
    Tiumpan Head Lighthouse, Detections of Trawling from —Extension of System to other Lighthouses on the Scottish Coast, proposed.
      Q. *Nov. 21*, 624.
  Transfer of British Trawlers to Foreign Flags, — *Bona fides* of Transfers—Result of Norwegian Government Action.
    Q. *Nov. 25*, 374.

Treasury.
  First Lord—Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Treaty Series.
  Orders in Council Presented, *Dec. 2*, 909, 910.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W. R., Elland]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Nov. 20*, 31; *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 388, 390; *Nov. 27*, 642.

Trim.
  Military Barracks, Occupancy of by District - Inspector Rogers—Yearly lodging allowance made to Inspector Rogers.
    Q. *Dec. 1*, 852.

Tristan da Cunha Islands
  Value of, for Telegraphic purposes—Retaining under British Sovereignty.
    Q. *Dec 2*, 925.

Trout
  Provisions of the Trout Preservation (Close Time) Act—Steps taken to make public.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 22.

Tuberculosis
  Bovine Tuberculosis — Comparisons of Home and Canadian Cattle, Report to the Corporation of Glasgow.
    Q. *Nov. 20*, 19.

Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, S.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.* *Nov. 26*, 539; 3R, *Dec. 2*, 1007.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill.
    Ireland—Amount of Equivalent Grant *Nov. 25*, 386.
    Roman Catholic Schools, Grant to—Amount to Equivalent Grant for Ireland, *Nov. 20*, 30.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
    Teachers' Superannuation Rights. Provision for Safe-guarding. *Dec, 1*, 854.
    Total Amount to be voted from Imperial Funds, *Nov. 25*, 386.
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 3R, *Dec. 1*, 905.
  Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Dec. 1*, 907 908.
  Ireland.
    Armagh Post Office Staff—Exclusion of Roman Catholics, alleged, *Dec. 2*, 923.
    Athy.
      Jurors List — Complaints as to method of preparation, *Dec. 2*, 924.
      Publican prosecuted by the Police for serving drunken man, *Nov. 20*, 24.
    Bagnalstown Petty Sessions Summonses — Constabulary claiming right to serve Summonses at the suit of the Town Commissioners. *Nov. 27*, 625, 626.
    Banbridge Petty Sessions—Prosecution of Campbell and Leary by Board of Guardians, Failure to convict, *Nov. 27*, 626.
    Bee-keeping Lectures at Glasnevin—Appointment of Mr. J. M. Gillies as Lecturer and Examiner, Qualifications, etc., *Dec. 1*, 853; *Dec. 4*, 1329, 1330.
    Belfast—Bread Contract for Barracks given to firm of Druggists and Chemists, *Nov. 27*, 629; *Dec. 2*, 918.
    Canadian Mail Service—Galway as a Transatlantic Port, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1332.
    Clement's, Col., Estate in South Leitrim—Fair Rent Applications' *Nov. 24*, 248.
    Congested Districts Board, Staff — Number of Officials and Clerks employed, *Nov. 27*, 627.
    Corkly Orange Lodge—Visit to Keady, Discharge of Firearms on the Public Road, Conduct of the Police, *Nov. 27*, 627, 628.
    De Freyne Estate—Cost of Extra Police, *Nov. 20*, 27.
    Dispensary Medical Officers' Salaries —Inequality in Remuneration of Local Officers and *Locum Tenens*, *Nov. 26*, 511.
    Dog Poisoning Cases at Ballaghaderreen—Police Report as to *Dec. 1*, 852.
    Dromod Pier, Condition of—Amount of Grant made to Shannon Development Company for Construc- of Pier, *Dec. 2*, 923.

[*cont.*

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Dromore, Disturbances—Police Protection for Mr. Russell, *Nov. 24*, 248, 249; *Nov. 26*, 510, 511.
    Dublin.
      Gas Poisoning, Deaths from—Percentage of Carburetted Water Gas supplied, *Dec. 4*, 1332.
      Phœnix Park Constabulary Depot, Prevalence of Infectious Diseases — Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
      Premises in Upper O'Connell Street locked up by the Police, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1330.
    Fahy, Michael, Fine imposed on for Attack on Dwelling house—Alleged misrepresentations by the Police, *Nov. 26*, 511.
    Grazing Lands, Compulsory Sale and Division of Lands amongst the Population in the Congested Districts, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 247.
    Hennessy, Robert, Warder at Maryborough Prison, Reasons for transfer to Mountjoy Prison, *Nov. 20*, 28.
    Hill Street Postal Service—Sunday Delivery of Letters, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 849.
    Horse-breeding Experiments--Amount expended by the Congested Districts Board during the last two years, *Nov. 27*, 627.
    Imprisonment of Members under the Crimes Act of 1887—Compulsory performance of Menial Tasks, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1330, 1331.
    Infirmaries.
      Expenditure, Instructions to Auditors to surcharge Illegal Expenditure, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 384.
      Roscommon Union Hospital, Management of — Inquiry into, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 853.
      Tipperary County Infirmary Committee—Refusal to carry out Suggestions of Local Government Board Auditor, *Nov. 24*, 248.
    Labourers' Acts, Complications in working of—Amendment of Acts, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1329.
    Land Question.
      Conference between Landlords and Tenants, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 925.
      Settlement of—Conference between the Government and the Irish Parliamentary Party, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 247.
    Lunatic Asylums in Sligo and Leitrim, Overcrowding in alleged, *Nov. 25*, 384.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Lynchehaun, Convict, Escape from Maryborough Gaol — Changes made in Prison Staff in consequence, *Nov. 20*, 28.
    Marine Store Dealers' Act, Enforcement of—Number of Prosecutions, etc., *Nov. 20*, 26.
    Mohill Workhouse Entertainment—Local Government Board Sanction, Licence for Sale of Liquors, etc., *Nov. 20*, 25.
    Railway Rates between Limerick and Liverpool—Action of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, *Nov. 27*, 628, 629.
    Roads, Condition of—Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 25.
    Rogers, District Inspector—Occupancy of Trim Military Barracks, Yearly lodging Allowance made to Inspector Rogers, *Dec. 1*, 852.
    Sandford Estate, Castlerea, Purchase of by the Congested Districts Board, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
    Second-term Rents—Total amount of reductions made by the Land Commission during the last twelve months, *Nov. 20*, 26.
    Shannon Development Company, Amount of Subsidy paid to, Discontinuance of Subsidy, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
    Sligo to Bundoran, Construction of Railway Line, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 382.
    Tallow—Cost of Extra Police, Area of Charge, etc., *Dec. 1*, 852.
    Union Solicitors and Medical Officers—Eligibility for Membership of County Councils, *Nov. 20*, 27.
    Waterford and Wexford Dispensaries—Vacancies, Date of filling, *Dec. 2*, 924.
  Irish Language.
    Dictionary of the Irish Language, Amount paid for preparation of, Progress of the Work, etc., *Nov. 26*, 512.
    Money Order, refusal of Postal Authorities to furnish because Names of Payee and Remitter were in Irish, *Nov. 26*, 508.
    Solicitors—Refusal of Incorporated Law Society to make Irish an optional subject in Examinations, *Nov. 26*, 509.
  Kensit, Mr. J. A., Imprisonment of—Reduction of Sentence, *Nov. 27*, 623.
  Penruddocke Cruelty Case, Decision of the Judge—Alteration of Law, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 506, 507.

Tunbridge Wells
  Telephone System—Purchase of Municipal System by National Telephone Co., Dispute between Town Council and Town Clerk—Local Inquiry, proposed. *Qs.* *Dec. 1*, 841, 846.

Tuns Bank, Lough Foyle
Gas and Bell Buoy, Erection of.
Q. *Dec. 3*, 1050.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Money Bills and the House of Lords—Financial Clauses of the Education Bill, Question of Privilege, *Dec. 1*, 832, 833.
Sugar Bounties, Brussels Convention—Opportunity for Discussion by House of Lords prior to Ratification, *Nov. 24*, 220.

Typhus
Lewis, Island of—Typhus Epidemic at Tolsta, Steps taken to prevent spread of.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 22; *Dec. 3*, 1065.

Uganda
Currency—Issue of Government Paper Currency, proposed.
Qs. *Nov. 20*, 16; *Nov. 24*, 243.

Unemployed
Aliens, Immigration of Pauper Aliens adding to the large number of unemployed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 622.
Hardships entailed on the Working Classes during times of Trade Depression—Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 622.
Local Authorities, Putting in hand Works of Sanitation and Improvement with a view to providing work, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 621.
Royal Commission of Inquiry, Appointment of, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 623.

United Irish League
Glenville meeting—Police interference, alleged.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1313.

United States of America
Educational System—Results obtained, etc.
O. Bishop of Newcastle, *Dec. 4*. 1244, 1248.
Sugar Bounties.
Countervailing Duties, Adoption of Principle by the United States.
O. Mr. G. Balfour, *Nov. 24*, 254.
Non-Representation of the United States at Brussels.
Os. Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov. 24*, 286, 287.
Trade, Increase in, since adoption of Protectionist Policy.
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *Nov, 24*, 346.
West Indian Sugar, United States Market for, *see* West Indies.

United Tramways Co.
Bushey Park, Concession of Land to the Tramway Co., alleged.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 236.

Universities, Scotland
Glasgow—Degrees of Science in Public Health, Regulations for, University Court Ordinance, Presented, *Nov. 20*, 2; *Nov. 21*, 145.

Upsala, Treaty of 1654]
Stamp Duties on British Insurance Policies in Sweden, Violation of the Treaty, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 495.

Vaccination
Exemption Certificates—Fees charged for, Powers of Magistrates to remit.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 611.
Return Presented, *Dec. 1*, 835.

Vancouver to Fanning Island Cable
Speed Trials, Results of Tests.
Q. *Dec. 4*, 1305.

Vaughan, Cardinal
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Cardinal Vaughan's opinion that the Bill was a triumph of the Government over the Nonconformist Opposition.
Os. Mr. Tully, Mr. Perks, *Dec. 2*, 1007.

Vegetables
Dutch Brined Vegetable Industry—Report Presented, *Nov. 25*, 373, 374.

Ventilation of Factories
Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 26*, 498.

Veterinary Surgeons
South African War.
Employment of Surgeons not Members of the R.C.V.S.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 11.
Gratuity—Non-participation of Surgeons employed at home, Terms of Agreement, etc.
Q. *Nov. 27*, 618.

Village Communities
Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children accommodated, etc.
Q. *Nov. 20*, 9.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1363, 1366.

Vlok, Rev. Mr.
Africa, South—Mr. Vlok deprived of living for loyalty to the Crown and the Government of Cape Colony during the War.
Q. *Nov. 24*, 239.

Voluntary Schools
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.
Jobbery in Distribution of Special Aid Grant—Charge against Diocesan Boards.
Observations in Debate on the Education Bill, Dec. 2, 959, 965.

Volunteers
- Ayr and Galloway Artillery Volunteers—Adjutancy, Date of filling Vacancy. *Q. Nov. 27*, 619.
- Capitation Grants and Camp Leave—Regulations of April 22, 1902. *Q. Nov. 20*, 14.
- London Irish Rifle Volunteers—Appointment of Service Officer to the Command, proposed. *Q. Dec. 3*, 1054.
- Long Service Medal—Alteration in, proposed. *Q. Nov. 27*, 615.
- Officers and the South African War.
  - Medals, Number of, bestowed on Volunteer Officers. *Q. Dec. 3*, 1056.
  - Number of Officers mentioned in Despatches serving with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments. *Q. Nov. 27*, 617.

Wales
- Cardiff—Accident on Great Western Railway on Nov. 14th, Inquiry. *Q. Nov. 21*, 147.
- Census—Return of Area, Houses and Population Presented, *Nov. 20*, 1.
- Llangollen National School — Children interrogated as to Religious Beliefs of Parents, Treatment of Children of Nonconformists. *Q. Nov. 25*, 383.
- Sunday Closing, Effect of Licensing Act of 1902, on—Issue of Explanatory notice in Welsh, proposed. *Q. Nov. 20*, 18; *Dec. 4*, 1324.

Walton, Mr. Joseph [York, W.R., Barnsley]
- India — Financial Situation, Irrigation Works and Railways, Amount spent in Famine Relief, Trade with Persia. etc., *Nov. 21*, 160, 164, 165.

Wanklyn, Mr. J. L. [Bradford, Central]
- Africa, South—Treatment of Loyalists, Prosecution by Boycotting—Cases of Rev. Mr. Vlok and Rev. J. F. Botha, *Nov. 24*, 239, 240.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 27*, 697, 3R; *Dec. 2*, 980.

War Office
- Documents of not sufficient value to justify Preservation, Schedule Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217, 229.

Warner, Mr. T. Courtenay [Stafford, Lichfield]
- London Water Bill, *com. Dec. 4*, 1346, 1411.
- Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders, Postponement, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 898.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
- Volunteer Long Service Medal–Alterations in, proposed, *Nov. 27*, 615.

Waterford
- Dispensary Medical Officer—Date of filling vacancy. *Q. Dec. 2*, 924.

Waverley Station, Edinburgh
- Accident to Shunter — Board of Trade Recommendation. *Q. Nov. 25*, 375.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
- Africa, South.
  - Blockhouses erected during the War, Cost of, Sale by Tender, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1317.
  - Permit Regulations, *Dec. 4*, 1316.
  - Pretoria Field Force Canteen—Regulations as to Contracts, *Dec. 2*, 919,
- Bilbao Harbour Lights—Defective System of Lighting, Representations to the Spanish Government, *Nov. 27*, 615.
- Borneo.
  - British North Borneo Mails—Arrangement with the P. & O. Steamship Company to call at a port in British North Borneo, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 507.
  - Railway to the Interior, Date of Completion, *Nov. 20*, 17.
- India—Land Revenue Question, Extension of period of Service for Officials, Irrigation Works, Case of Krishna Rao Raghunath, etc., *Nov. 21*, 175.
- Japan—Kobe, Beverages exported during 1900-1901, Nature and value of, *Dec. 1*, 837; *Dec. 4*, 1322.
- Navy.
  - Ammunition—Defective Ammunition thrown overboard — Names of Officials responsible for Manufacture, Examination, Testing and taking into Stock of Defective Ammunition, *Dec. 2*, 917.
  - China Squadron—Supplying with Coal from British North Borneo proposed, *Nov. 26*, 502.
- Private Bills—Report of Select Committee, *Dec. 3*, 1067.
- Railways—Communication between Passengers and Guard, Provision of Apparatus on Carriages of the Great Eastern Railway Company, *Nov. 27*, 609, 610; *Dec. 4*, 1325.
- Scotland.
  - Harbours—Grants-in-Aid, Relaxation of Regulations under which Grants-in-Aid are made, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 505.
  - Lewis, Island of
    - Barvas—Medical Officer's Report—Non-publication of, *Nov. 27*, 624.
    - Burying Grounds, Provision of in the Stornoway District, *Nov. 20*, 21.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
Lewis, Island of—*cont.*
Cottars and Crofters—Provision of Holdings for, Utilising Deer Forests, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 921 ; *Dec. 3*, 1063, 1064.
Fevers, Prevalence of—Visit of Local Government Board Medical Officer, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 374.
Holm, Loch, Construction of Dry Dock at—Petition for grant from the Congested Districts Board, *Dec. 1*, 838.
Sanitary Condition—Local Government Inspector's Report, *Dec. 1*, 837.
Shader, Landing Place—Delay in Construction of, *Nov. 27*, 625.
Tolsta — Outbreak of Typhus, Steps taken to prevent spread of, *Nov. 20*, 22 ; *Dec. 3*, 1065.
Tom - an - Fhuadain, Absence of pathway to the School—Grant-in-Aid proposed, *Nov. 20*, 20.
Trades and Handicrafts, Teaching of — Recommendations of Crofters' Commission, *Dec. 3*, 1064.
Water Supply—Provision of Wells with Force Pumps, *Dec. 4*, 1303.
Mallaig—West Highland Railway—Annual Report as to Condition and Working of, *Dec. 4*, 1326.
North British Railway, Tow-roping Accident at Ayton Station—Discontinuance of practice of Tow-roping, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 504.
Railways—Accident to Shunter at Waverley Station, Board of Trade Recommendations, *Nov. 25*, 375.
Road Construction in Western Ross-shire—Application for Grant-in-Aid, *Dec. 4*, 1303.
Stornoway.
Fishermens' Dwellings, Allocation of Sites, *Nov. 20*, 21.
Mail Service—Refusal of Messrs. MacBrayne to convey Goods from Stornoway to Kyle, alleged, *Dec. 3*, 1066.
Trawling.
British - owned Trawlers under Foreign Flags fishing in Moray Firth — Legislation proposed, *Dec. 2*, 912.
Broad Bay, Illegal Trawling in.
Cruiser for protection of interests of Line Fishermen, Application for Treasury Grant, *Dec. 2*, 922.
Frequent Occurrence of cases —Legislation, proposed, *Nov. 26*, 507.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
Trawling—*cont.*
Penalties for — Increasing the Maximum Penalty, proposed, *Dec. 4*, 1327.
Transfer of British Trawlers to Foreign Flags, *Bona fides* of Transfers, *Nov. 25*, 374.
Vaccination, Exemption Certificates—Fees charged for Powers of Magistrate to remit, *Nov. 27*, 611.

Welby, Lieut-Col. A. C. [Taunton]
Lottery and Gambling Circulars distributed by Post—Making a Punishable Offence, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 840.

West Indies
Indentured Labour—Number of Labourers imported during the last five years. *Q. Nov. 20*, 16.
Sugar Industry—Abolition of Sugar Bounties by Brussels Convention.
Debate on Sugar Bounties Convention Nov. 24, 254.
Cartel System, Effect on West Indian Industry, 258.
Claim of the West Indies—"Fair Play" for the Sugar Industry, etc., 304, 305, 322, 352, 360.
Cost of Production of Sugar, 262. Reduction, 292.
Credit and Regularity in Trade.
"A Vanished Quantity," 258, 306.
Recovery which would follow Abolition of Bounties, 289, 293, 356.
Cuban Opposition, Serious Nature of, 283, 336.
Doubtful Effects of Abolition on West Indian Industry—Royal Commission's Opinion, 331, 336, 337.
Grants-in-Aid, Policy of, compared with Policy of the Convention 300, 354, 362—Royal Commission Recommendation, 331.
Gravity of Consequences which must follow a Collapse of Sugar Industry, 257, 295.
Price of Sugar, Extent of Rise necessary to benefit the West Indies, 278, 279, 281, 305, 325, 356, 361.
Recovery, Possibility of, 259.
Relative Unimportance of West Indies, 330, 362.
Total Sugar Production of West Indies, Amount exported to Great Britain, Amount exported to United States, 279, 319, 322, 326, 328, 330, 335, 354, 361.
United States Market for West Indies.
Effect of Convention on Indian Sugar, 300, 326, 331, 335.
Probable speedy Disappearance, 283, 353

Westbourne Park Station
Railway Accident at—Result of Inquiry. *Q. Dec. 1*, 839.

Westminster, City of
London Water Bill, Exceptional position secured for Westminster.
Observations on Recommittal of Bill, Dec. 4, 1396, 1400, 1402, 1403.

Wexford
Dispensary Medical Officer — Date of filling vacancy.
Q. Dec. 2, 924.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 20*, 65 ; *con., Nov. 25*, 455, 456 ; *Nov. 26*, 515, 522, 523.

White, Mr. Luke [York, E.R., Buckrose]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 27*, 647, 648.
South African War.
Medals—Number awarded to Volunteer and Colonial Officers respectively, *Dec. 3*, 1056.
Officers mentioned in Despatches, serving with Volunteer Companies and Engineer Detachments, *Nov. 27*, 617, 618.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [York, W.R., Pudsey]
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1384, 1396, 1397.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 20*, 35, 37, 42, 44, 51, 85, 103, 104, 107 ; *con. Nov. 27*, 646, 647.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1399.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 26*, 558.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 27*, 634.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [York, W.R., Holmfirth]
Africa, South.
Martial Law Notices advertised in *Het Oosten*, Delay in payment of Account, *Nov. 21*, 149.
Permit Regulations, Oath of Allegiance, etc.—Case of M. du Toit *Nov. 24*, 233.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Nov. 20*, 39.
India—Opium Revenue for last three years, *Nov. 21*, 149.
London Water Bill, *com., Dec. 4*, 1391.
Poor Law Children — Names of Unions which have established Village Communities, Number of Children Accommodated, etc., *Nov. 20*, 9.

Wilson, Mr. John [Durham, Mid]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con., Nov. 26*, 553.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N].
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con. Nov. 26*, 547.

Wilts.
Census of Areas, Houses and Population —Return Presented, *Dec. 2*, 910 ; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Windermere, Lake
Collisions by Vessels navigating, Rules for Prevention of—Orders in Council Presented, *Nov. 24*, 217.

Wireless Telegraphy
Lighthouses and Lightships, Connecting with Shore by means of Wireless Telegraphy, proposed.
Q. Dec. 2, 912.

Women
New South Wales Women's Franchise Act—Copy presented, *Nov. 26*, 493.
Scotland—Number of Women employed as Barmaids, Date of issue of Return.
Q. Nov. 28, 748.

Wood, Mr. J. [Down Co., E.]
Ireland.
Ardglass Labourers' Cottages—Delay in erection, *Dec. 4*, 1329.
Mail Car Contractors—Losses incurred through unpunctuality of trains, etc., *Dec. 4*, 1326.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Finance — Immediately available Funds of Education Authorities, *Nov. 28*, 744.
Municipal Corporation—Position of with regard to Continuous Liabilities, *Nov. 28*, 744.

Woolwich Arsenal
Ordnance Factories, Discharge of Workmen—Employment in other Departments, proposed.
Q. Nov. 26, 499.
Small Arms Ammunition, Weekly output.
Q. Nov. 26, 499.

Workhouses.
Accounts, Method of Keeping—Report of Committee of Inquiry, Delay in Publication.
Q. Nov. 24, 230.
Canterbury—Army and Navy Reservists in Workhouse, Exemption from Stone breaking proposed.
Q. Dec. 4, 1311.
Grove Park Workhouse—Local Government Board Loan, Extension of period of repayment, Proposed Deputation to Mr. Long.
Q. Nov. 20, 10.
Inquiry into Nursing of Sick Poor in Workhouses, Report and Summary of Recommendations Presented *Nov. 24*, 229 ; *Nov. 25*, 373.

Ireland
Infirm Inmates in—Treatment of.
Q. Dec. 1, 854.

Women—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Mohill Workhouse Entertainment, Local Government Board Sanction, Licence for Sale of Liquor, etc. *Qs. Nov. 20*, 25, 26.
Union Solicitors and Medical Officers—Eligibility for Membership of County Councils. *Q. Nov. 20*, 27.
Scotland, Pauper Lunatics in—Rules as to, Presented, *Dec. 2*, 910 ; *Dec. 4*, 1189.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. Stuart [Sheffield, Hallam]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, con., *Nov. 28*, 763.
Questions in the House—Time occupied in the giving of Oral Answers to Questions, *Dec. 1*, 855.

Wylie, Mr. A. [Dumbartonshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, 3R, *Dec. 3*, 1157.
India—Irrigation Works for India on a Scale similar to that of the recently-constructed Nile Works—Recommendations of Famine Commission of 1901, etc., *Nov. 21*, 150.

Wyman & Sons, Ltd., Messrs.
"Parliamentary Debates," Contract for Printing.
Copy Ordered, *Nov. 20*, 4 ; Presented, *Nov. 21*, 146.
Terms of Contract, Figures quoted in First and Second Tender, Fair Wage Clause, etc.
Qs. Dec. 3, 1061, 1062, 1063.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G., *Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
Athy Jurors' List—Complaints as to Method of Preparation, *Dec. 2*, 924.
Bee-keeping, Glasnevin Lectures on—Appointment of Mr. J. M. Gillies as Lecturer and Examiner, Qualifications, etc., *Dec. 1*, 853 ; *Dec, 4*, 1330.
Boycotting—Number of Families and Persons boycotted throughout Ireland, *Dec. 4*, 1328.
Congested Districts Board, Ireland.
Sandford Estate, Castlerea, Purchase of, by the Congested Districts Board, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
Staff—Number of Officials and Clerks employed, *Nov. 27*, 627, 628.
Constabulary, Royal Irish,
Phoenix Park Depôt, Prevalence of Infectious Disease—Enforcement of Sanitary Laws, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
Rogers, District Inspector, Occupancy of Trim Military Barracks — Yearly Lodging Allowance made to Inspector Rogers, *Dec. 1*, 852.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
Tallow—Cost of Extra Police, Area of Charge, etc., *Dec. 1*, 853.
Corkly Orange Lodge, Visit to Keady, Discharge of Firearms on the Public Road, Conduct of the Police, *Nov. 27*, 628.
County Council Electoral Divisions—Inquiry into Boundaries, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 247.
Crimes Act of 1887 — Imprisonment of Members under, Compulsory performance of Menial Tasks, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1331.
De Freyne Estate—Cost of Extra Police, *Nov. 20*, 27.
Dispensary Medical Officers, Ireland.
Salaries—Inequality in Remuneration of Local Officers and *Locum Tenens*, *Nov. 26*, 511.
Waterford and Wexford Dispensaries —Vacancies, Date of filling, *Dec. 2*, 924.
Dog Poisoning Cases at Ballaghaderreen, Police Report, as to, *Dec. 1*, 852.
Downpatrick — Sunday Demonstrations during Church hours, Prohibition proposed, *Dec. 1*, 851.
Dromore Disturbances—Police Protection for Mr. Russell, *Nov. 24*, 249, *Nov. 26*, 511.
Dublin—Premises in Upper O'Connell Street locked up by the Police, alleged, *Dec. 4*, 1330.
Education—Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners—Enforcing decision of Education Commissioners, *Dec. 3*, 1067.
Fahy, Michael, Fine imposed on for Attack on Dwelling house—Alleged misrepresentations by the Police, *Nov. 26*, 511, 512.
Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Dec. 1*, 906, 907.
Horse-breeding Experiments—Amount expended by the Congested Districts Board during the last two years, *Nov. 27*, 627.
Infirmaries—Expenditure, Instructions to Auditors to Surcharge Illegal Expenditure proposed, *Nov. 25*, 384.
Tipperary County Infirmary Committee — Refusal to carry out suggestion of Local Government Board Auditor, *Nov. 24*, 248.
Irish Language—Dictionary of the Irish Language, Amount paid for preparation of, Progress of the Work, etc., *Nov. 26*, 512.
Labourers' Acts, Complications in working of—Amendment of Acts, proposed *Dec. 4*, 1329.
Labourers' Cottages, Ardglass, Delay in erection of Cottages, *Dec. 4*, 1329.
Land Commission, Ireland.
Clement's, Col., Estate in South Leitrim—Fair Rent Applications, *Nov. 24*, 248.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Land Commission, Ireland—*cont.*
  - Ogilby Estate—Delay in Sale to Tenants, *Dec. 4*, 1328.
  - Second-term Rents, Total Amount of Reductions granted during the last Twelve Months, *Nov. 20*, 26; *Dec. 4*, 1327.
- Land Question, Ireland.
  - Conference between Landlords and Tenants, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 925.
  - Grazing Lands—Compulsory Sale and Division of Lands amongst the Population in the Congested Districts, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 248.
  - Settlement of—Conference between the Government and the Irish Parliamentary Party, proposed, *Nov. 24*, 247.
- Longford—Boarding-out Dispute, Guardians' Action against Jane Devine, *Nov. 27*, 627.
- Lunatic Asylums—Sligo and Leitrim Asylums, Overcrowding in, alleged, *Nov. 25*, 384.
- Marine Store Dealers' Act, Enforcement of—Number of Prosecutions, etc., *Nov. 20*, 27; *Dec. 3*, 1066.
- Medical Officers—Poor Law Officers, Holiday Grievance, *Dec. 1*, 854.
- National School Teachers.
  - Belfast—Payments of Balance of Grade Salary, *Nov. 26*, 509.
  - Physical Science and Manual Instruction, Provision for Training of Teachers, alleged, *Dec. 1*, 851.
- Newtown Butler Petty Sessions—Cases tried at Magistrate's Residence instead of in Court, Irregularity of proceeding, *Dec. 1*, 852.
- Prisons, Ireland.
  - Lynchehaun, Convict, Escape from Maryborough Gaol—Changes made in Prison Staff in consequence, *Nov. 20*, 28.
  - Warders—Transfer of R. Hennessy from Maryborough to Mountjoy Prison, *Nov. 20*, 28.
- Railways, Ireland.
  - Carndonagh-Buncrana Railway—Tax levied on guaranteeing Area, Payment of by the County Council of Donegal—Illegality of Charge, alleged, Refunding Money to the Ratepayers, etc., *Dec. 1*, 850.
  - State Purchase of—Appointment of Royal Commission of Inquiry, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 850.
- Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Health of Children—Neglect to carry out Recommendations of Inspector, alleged, *Nov. 26*, 510.
- Roads, Ireland.
  - Ballybrophy Station to Rathdowney, Condition of Road—Appointment of Special Inspector, proposed, *Nov. 20*, 24, 25.
  - Hill of Down to Ballivor, Condition of Road, *Nov. 20*, 26.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Roscommon, Union Hospital, Management of, Inquiry into, proposed, *Dec. 1*, 853.
- Shannon Development Company, Amount of Subsidy paid to, Discontinuance of, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 385.
- Workhouses—Ireland.
  - Infirm Inmates, Treatment of, *Dec. 1*, 854.
  - Mohill Workhouse Entertainment—Local Government Board Sanction, Licence for Sale of Liquor, etc., *Nov. 20*, 25, 26.
  - Union Solicitors and Medical Officers, Eligibility for Membership of County Councils, *Nov. 20*, 27.

Yangtsze Valley
- International Situation in—Effect on position of Great Britain.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1312.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]
- Army—Strength of the Regular Army at Home, *Dec. 3*, 1056.
- Bounties on Agricultural and other products given by Foreign Countries—Return, proposed, *Dec. 2*, 913.
- China—Railways, Russian Branch Line from Main Siberian Railway to Pekin, Construction of alleged, *Dec. 1*, 837.
- Navy—Gunnery, Rewards for proficiency, Alterations in Regulations since introduction of quick-firing Guns, *Dec. 1*, 840.
- Newfoundland — Agreement between Great Britain and France, alleged, *Dec. 2*, 914.
- South African War — Commission of Inquiry, Nature of Evidence, Terms of Reference, *Dec 3*, 1055.

Younger, J.
- Cruelty to Animals Case, Further Inquiry, proposed.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 375.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
- Cruelty to Animals, Case of J. Younger—Further Inquiry, proposed, *Nov. 25*, 375.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *Nov. 25*, 421, 458; *Nov. 26*, 599, 606; *Nov. 28*, 773, 789, 790, 792.
- Osborne Estate Bill, 2R, *Nov. 21*, 215.
- Parliamentary Procedure, New Rules—Conversion of Rules already passed from Sessional into Standing Orders—Objections to Rule empowering the Speaker to adjourn the House without Question put, etc., *Dec 1*, 891, 899.

Zafarini Islands
- Russian Acquisition of as Coaling Station, Danger to Gibraltar, etc.
  - *Q.* *Dec. 4*, 1322.

Zodiac Steam Fishing Company.
- Registration of British Trawlers at Brevig—*Bona fides* of Transfer to Norwegian Flag.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 25*, 375.